

POSTAGE, Paid in Advance, 4 Cts. per No. or 16 Cts. per Year.

285,5

D2

# DANVILLE REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

*In Association of Ministers.*

MARCH, 1864.

---

*Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.*

---

DANVILLE, KY.

PRINTED FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOLD BY

MOORE, WILSTACH & BALDWIN,

35 WEST FOURTH STREET,

CINCINNATI.

SOLD ALSO BY WM. S. & A. MARTIN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT CARTER &  
BROTHERS, NEW YORK; LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON;  
KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; BIBLE AND  
TRACT HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1863, by JACOB COOPER, for the Association,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I.—THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF CHURCH AUTHORITY. By Rev. R. L. Stanton, D. D. . . . .	1
II.—THE NATION'S SUCCESS AND GRATITUDE. <i>The Substance of a Discourse on Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1863.</i> By Rev. Ro. J. Breckinridge, D. D. . . .	40
III.—BAPTIST REVISION OF THE BIBLE. <i>Revision of "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The common English version, corrected by the Final Committee of the American Bible Union."</i> By Rev. Ed. P. Humphrey, D. D. . . .	57
IV.—THE LOYALTY DEMANDED BY THE PRESENT CRISIS. By Rev. Jacob Cooper. . . . .	88
V.—DISLOYALTY IN THE CHURCH. <i>The Mt. Pleasant Church Case in and out of the Church Courts.</i> By Rev. Geo. Morrison. . . . .	112
VI.—THE MEN OF DANVILLE. No. I. <i>A Biographical Sketch of the Rev. John C. Young, D. D., late President of Centre College.</i> By J. A. Jacobs, . . . . .	151
VII.—NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Rev. Joel K. Lyle. . . . .	167

---

Volumes I and II, of this work, may be obtained of the Publishers at \$2.00 per volume, or Volumes I, II, and III for the years 1861, 1862, and 1863, at \$6 for the set in numbers.





Gen  
Coll  
4-18  
195

Compl sets  
College of Worcester  
4-18-29  
19529

# DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. I.

---

MARCH, 1864.

---

## ART. I.—*The Nature and Extent of Church Authority.*

THIS article is intended, in part, as a critique upon a pamphlet of forty pages, by James Brown, Esq., entitled *The Church and the State, their Relations to each other*; but mainly designed to set forth what we regard as the true doctrine upon the Nature and Extent of Church Authority, to declare "all the counsel of God," as made known in his word.

The pamphlet of Mr. Brown is a "review of an article in the *Danville Review* of December, 1862," this article being the first of two upon "Politics and the Church," which it was our pleasure to write. We should not attempt a rejoinder to his reply, were it not that the case affords a proper occasion not only to correct some apparent misapprehensions of our meaning into which he and possibly some others may have fallen, but to vindicate more fully a doctrine which is vital to the true theory of the church, and essential to the fulfillment of her mission among men.

Mr. Brown is an entire stranger to us, but we presume he is a lawyer by profession and a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church. We must say that we rejoice, in this day of political turmoil, that any of this class of men are disposed to give serious attention to such topics as are discussed in this pamphlet. It appears to be written, for the most part, with fairness, viewed from his particular stand point, and to be pervaded with a general good temper; though his misapprehensions have led him to do us an occasional injustice, and his unwar-

ranted fears have betrayed him into some harshness of speech toward many of the clergy.

We find, on opening the pamphlet, a preliminary note, complaining of the conductors of this *Review* for not admitting his article into its pages. "The following article," says Mr. Brown, "was written for the *Danville Review* in reply, &c. It was expected that the conductors of that periodical, after having admitted argument on one side of the question, would have fairness and candor enough to allow the other side to be heard also. This, however, was denied, and therefore the appearance of the article in the present form."

When Mr. Brown's article was read by the editors, our individual wish was expressed that it might be admitted, but we were overruled. Of this decision Mr. Brown was duly informed. His intimation of a want of "fairness and candor" towards him—rather a serious charge at any time—is probably from a want of due information of what is common law in conducting periodicals of this character. It is a rule generally governing such in all countries, not to admit articles of the nature of reviews, criticising and controverting those which appear; that such periodicals are established to advocate those opinions which their conductors wish especially to promulgate, and therefore, that there can be no obligation upon them to admit any thing contrary thereto; that their liberty, however, is not abridged by this rule, but when they waive it the case is an exception, of which they are to be the sole judges. It was as an exception that we urged admission in this case. The justice of this common law is obvious at a glance. The press, however, is free, and Mr. Brown has availed himself of it.

The article opens with a quotation from Edmund Burke, which serves "as a fitting introduction to the thoughts" which the writer wishes "to express on the true relation existing between the Church and the State." This extract from Burke serves "as a fitting introduction" quite as well for our purpose also; for it allows us to say of our reviewer, what we have often observed in a large class of writers who side with him, that he assumes the very thing to be proved, and the assumption is of that which is radical as underlying the whole controversy, or he aims at the outset to forestall a judgment in his favor. "Politics and the pulpit," says Burke, "are terms

that have little agreement." If there is anything in this which is "fitting" in its application to the article we wrote, it means that we defended the right to introduce politics into the pulpit, a position which on the contrary we directly denied; or, it means that the doctrine we laid down and advocated—that it is the province of the pulpit and of church courts to expound and set forth all that God has taught, as well that which concerns men's duties to the State as any other things revealed in the Scriptures—necessarily involves the preaching of "politics," a proposition which is of the essence of the whole matter in discussion. We can see nothing "fitting" in the quotation unless it means one of these things. That we are right in this, is evident from what Mr. Burke further says of ministers, which the reviewer intended of course to apply, viz: "Those who quit their proper character to assume what does not belong to them, are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they leave and the character they assume. Wholly unacquainted with the world in which they are so fond of meddling, and inexperienced in all its affairs, on which they pronounce with so much confidence, they have nothing of politics but the passions they excite." Here is not only full confirmation of what we have said, but this is a coarse and offensive imputation—which nothing in our article justifies—upon the character of a very large number in a most honorable profession, founded upon taking for granted what should be proved, and what indeed can not be. It furnishes a "fitting" opportunity for the retort which this class of writers lay themselves liable to, that ministers, even as a whole profession, are quite as well "acquainted with the world," as lawyers and statesmen, as a class, are with the church; and that they seldom "pronounce with so much confidence" upon what are solely the world's affairs, as we often see politicians, both small and great, very forward to do, about those matters of church doctrine and order which demand long and arduous study fully to understand—an example of which we have before us; and as to the "passions" excited in these classes respectively, we leave that to the observation which any man can make as he witnesses the proceedings at the English hustings, or looks into the courts or legislative halls of our own country.

This wholesale condemnation of large bodies of men in a

most honorable profession, for what here and there an over-zealous or even unworthy member, found in all professions, may do, is in bad taste, and an unwarranted proscription; and it furnishes the "fitting" occasion further to note, in passing, what we have often witnessed since the occurrence of our present civil war, that those politicians who denounce "preaching politics," generally withhold condemnation from "political preachers" proper, provided they are on their side, but bitterly complain of those who are opposed to them, and this too whether they are heard from the pulpit or in ecclesiastical bodies or through the press. Even the great parliamentary orator cited was not an exception to this discrimination in his time. When Great Britain was entering upon that struggle with her American Colonies, which resulted in their independence, and Burke and Chatham and Camden and Rockingham and others were endeavoring to stem the tyranny of Lord North and his supporters, they did not despise the powerful aid given the opposition party by the trenchant pen of the Dean of Gloucester. Churchman though he was, yet an "Apostle of Free Trade," he defended the Colonies against taxation and the other oppressive measures of the ministry, and was deemed a valuable auxiliary to the resistance party in parliament. Indeed he went beyond them, and took the ground boldly for separation, urging, "Declare North America independent," and prophetically added, "measures evidently right will prevail at last." This was "preaching politics" outright, and not by a Bishop who had a seat in the House of Lords, but by a Dean; and yet the statesmen of that day of the party with which Burke acted, were glad of so powerful an ally, though found only in the Church.

We regret to find these aspersions in the opening lines of Mr. Brown's pamphlet, and we still more regret that they are not the only offensive flings against the ministry in which he indulges. Apparently stimulated by the example of his great prototype, he at length far outstrips him. He uses these expressions of the clergy and the rulers of the church: "Who are ever found so ready to laud themselves as the peculiar favorites of God;" also, "the impression kept up by clergymen, that, because they have been accustomed to teach, THEREFORE they are to be received as the authorized teachers of the word of God;"



they exhibit "more of the spirit of *bitterness and intolerance* than is commonly found with any other *class* of men;" and also, "they seek to grasp at those questions about which they *know nothing*."

Our reviewer must have been very unfortunate in his acquaintance with the clergy, if he has ever met with any Protestant ministers who "laud themselves" as here described, or who base their claim to be "teachers" on the ground here stated. As to "bitterness and intolerance," we know something of ministers and church courts, and of lawyers too, and we are quite sure we have never witnessed such *striking* exhibitions of these qualities as may almost any day be seen in a county court house; but we have never, for that reason, felt warranted in assailing that respectable profession as a "class." Nor should we feel justified in saying that they "know nothing" about matters beyond their own profession, or even matters pertaining to ours; but we think it will be seen in the sequel, in this case at least, that Mr. Brown's want of information upon what belongs to the church, scarcely justifies him in speaking quite so oracularly. He exhibits far too plainly that although he may possibly be useful to that remarkable species of the *genus clericus* he seems to have met with, he is poorly qualified to become the instructor of the great body of the clergy about the functions of their office, and the nature and extent of the authority of the church. We hope to make this appear before we dismiss the subject. It is true, that, after having expended his strength against positions maintained by nearly all the ministers and churches of the Christian world, he puts in, near the close of his pamphlet, this *caveat*: "Nor, in speaking of the clergy, do we wish to be understood as referring to all that class, but only such as bring themselves within the range of our remarks." But the exceptions to those condemned by him — so far as the latter stand simply upon the main propositions we elaborated in the article he reviews — are found mainly in those churches among Protestants which are in alliance with the State; so that, though he may not "wish to be understood as referring" to the mass of the profession, his reasonings, wittingly or unwittingly, are directed against nearly the whole body of ministers and churches of all denominations. There is no objection to this, provided his arguments are sound. We now, in passing,

simply note the fact, that in spite of this *caveat* his condemnations are sweeping, and his style of dealing surprisingly confident. We quite agree with him that "the present age is disposed to measure these claims by the amount of argument that can be brought to bear in their favor." We shall endeavor to put his pretensions on the one hand and our claims on the other to this fair test.

Let us, then, approach the main questions in discussion. There are two of them, suggested by the manner in which Mr. Brown treats the subject. What is the nature and extent of the authority, if any, which the church has in expounding the word of God? What topics are properly embraced within the range of her teachings? These questions cover the whole subject as now presented. In the two papers we published in former numbers of the *Review*, the latter was the main point treated, as it involved that on which persons at present seemed to be the most divided. It was, substantially, whether the ministry and church courts could canvass and determine, in any manner or extent, certain matters, by some deemed "political," by others "ecclesiastical;" in a word, it involves the issue, What subjects are political or secular, and what ecclesiastical? The first of the two questions above named was only treated incidentally. We did not suppose the doctrine laid down, if understood, would be questioned, for it is the doctrine of nearly the whole Christian world. Those who do not acknowledge it, are found chiefly, and almost wholly, among those corrupt sects which have departed from the evangelical faith of Protestantism. We regarded it as taken for granted by all those who hold the cardinal doctrines of the Reformation, that whatever the church, by her ministry and courts, could teach at all, she could teach "authoritatively," in the sense in which this term is commonly understood in the church, and with the qualifications which we then stated with great definiteness and several times repeated; and that, in using this and similar terms, we were but using the common language of the ablest writers in all branches of the church; all which will appear to be so, in due time. But it seems we were mistaken in presuming upon full acquiescence. As Mr. Brown appears to view the matter, the question of church "authority" is the main one. He attacks our positions with vigor. He denies that the church has any

"authority," touching the interpretation of the word of God upon any subject even of the most strictly spiritual nature. These denials are very explicit in terms, and several times repeated. For example, to give his own words, he denies "that the church, through her ministry and courts, is, in any proper sense, God's 'authorized expounder of his law,' or that it has any divine commission at all to determine 'authoritatively' the meaning of the Scriptures on any point whatever, either ecclesiastical or secular." Indeed, the words "authority," "authoritative," and the like, which we used, have thoroughly frightened him. He sees Papal bulls and the Inquisition on every hand. "It is just that claimed by Popes and Councils, no more, no less," exclaims he; "the thunders of the Vatican, of which this seems to be the echo;" and then, "the assertion of any such arrogant pretensions for any merely human tribunal, would have been more befitting the days of Gregory VII, than it is the afternoon of the nineteenth century;" and he threatens us with the Reformation and the weight of the whole Protestant world.

The issue is thus a plain and an important one, and we shall aim to meet it squarely. Touching the first question above mentioned, we shall show: 1. That in applying the terms "authoritatively," &c., to the ministry and church courts, we but conformed to the ordinary *usus loquendi* of the church, as seen in her standards of faith and among her ablest writers from the Reformation downward. 2. That they claim for the church, under these terms, a real authority, in her ministers and courts, concerning doctrine, worship, and government; and we shall show the nature and extent of this authority, as thus claimed. 3. That this claim is founded upon the clearest teachings of the word of God, in direct command, precept, and practice.

In controverting a writer's sentiments, it is always a fair demand that his chief propositions shall be justly presented, with their qualifications and limitations, and that all his deductions shall be judged in the light of these principal propositions. It is just here that we complain of our reviewer. He has not seen fit to give our main propositions their true place, and he presents them in such a manner, with an omission of many of their chief limiting and qualifying clauses, that they appear to

teach a very different thing from that intended. We were careful to limit the "authority" of ministers and church courts *by the word of God*, stating that this was the only rule of faith. We presented this with a fullness and frequency to which Mr. Brown does not do justice, and we might almost charitably suspect that it had escaped his observation; else how could he seriously charge us with teaching a Papal doctrine of authority, when no principle concerning the Romish church is more clearly settled than this, that she repudiates the Scriptures as the only rule of faith?

Our main proposition was this: "That it is within the true province of the pulpit and of church courts, to examine and determine all questions upon all subjects, in their religious bearings, which affect the moral, social, and civil well-being of society; *the Bible being their guide as to topics and the views to be taken of them*, and the province of God, in the exercise of a wise discretion, determining the occasions on which they shall be presented."—*Review*, Dec. 1862, p. 613. Then these statements follow, scattered all through the article: "In treating a subject of this nature, *the Scriptures are our first, last, and only conclusive appeal*" (p. 614); "to the church is authoritatively committed the high duty of making known the will of God to men," and therefore, "the church, by her ministry and her courts, in all her utterances, *in so far as they are conformed to the Scriptures*, speaks in the name and by the full authority of her Divine Head;" and then, after acknowledging the right of private judgment, stating, "but while this is so, it is no less clear that it is within the true province of the Church, not only, but her bounden and solemn duty, as under Christ, 'the light of the world,' to give, through her ministry and her courts, her best powers, her most laborious zeal, and her most fervent prayers, first, to ascertain, *as far as in her lies, what God's will is, concerning all man's duties, as revealed in the Scriptures*, and then solemnly to declare that will, for the guide of the body of Christ, committed to her watch and care, and for the instruction of the world at large" (p. 615); "it is the duty of the ministry and the church to give instruction, *according to God's revealed will*, upon those subjects which now agitate the mind and oppress the heart of this nation, in every part of the State and in every branch of the Church" (p. 621); "is the will of

God *revealed upon it?*—if so, that is the end of controversy, and the church is authorized and bound to declare that will” (p. 622); and very much more to the same effect. Now it appears, that while Mr. Brown quotes very largely from this article, using the ordinary marks of quotation, he does not quote our first and chief proposition at all, but gives a partial view of it in his own language, and even that out of place; and then, though giving several extracts from the article upon our positions, he omits altogether the foregoing phrases which are italicised, thus conveying an impression to the general reader that we exalted the church and the ministry to an undue position of authority, even above the word of God, into full company with Rome.

To the same effect is the use made of certain terms we employed in these propositions. He impresses a meaning upon “authoritative,” “authorized,” etc., which, as made to bear upon our doctrine of the Church, involves the claim to a sort of infallibility; that is, if the ministry may, in any proper sense, preach, or if the church may, in any proper sense, pronounce a judgment “authoritatively,” it involves what is equivalent to investing them with infallibility, such as is claimed by the Church of Rome. Thus, in noticing our statement that “the church is God’s authorized expounder of his will,” he says: “The thunders of the Vatican of which this seems to be the echo, are to be revived to enforce obedience to the decrees of the church; and with its ministry and courts girt with the divine right to expound the Bible, and make known to us its meaning, the next step would doubtless be to abolish all diversity of opinion as to what it does teach.” Whether we really make any such claim as this, depends upon what we mean in the positions we have laid down, and we have shown that we intend nothing of the kind; but whether our language necessarily involves such claim—which is certainly a fair question, and the real point here—depends upon whether the meaning which Mr. Brown gives to the particular terms mentioned, is the necessary and only meaning, or the usual and prevailing one; for at this point, the whole matter in debate turns upon the signification of these important words. Is he right, then, in assigning such a meaning to them as the only admissible one; or, if we use them differently, are we warranted in this?

These points are easily determined; the former by appealing to an acknowledged standard for popular usage, and the latter by showing that our use is the one common to the Protestant Church. Let us then apply these fair tests.

Webster defines these words thus: "*Authoritative*, having due authority." "*Authoritatively*, in an authoritative manner; with a show of authority; with due authority." "*Authorized*, warranted by right; supported or established by authority; derived from legal or proper authority; having power or authority." These are the various forms of the word "authority" used in our articles. But we give this word also, selecting from its eight designations the only one which is appropriate: "*Authority*, 1. Legal power, or a right to command or to act; as the authority of a prince over subjects, and of parents over children; power; rule; sway."

Now does this popular usage assign to these words anything like an absolute, independent, or infallible quality, either in the essence of the power, or in regard to the persons or things concerning which it may be employed, all which enters into the claim of the Papacy? Is not, rather, the whole limited by the very will and law of God? Is not all "authority," here, referred to a standard outside of and above those who exercise it; a real authority, yet "warranted by right" only, whether that of "prince over subjects," or of "parents over children?" It is precisely so in regard to that which we claim for the ministry and the church, an authority subordinate to the revealed will of God, and yet a real authority, as we shall show. Our reviewer is thus not sustained in the meaning he would impress upon our words; and the alarm, therefore, he has sounded about the terrors of the Vatican is amusing, while the imputation made in another place that we are "claiming the right to denounce the curses of God on those who think or teach differently," is both false and ludicrous. He has made to himself a man of straw, and deals his mightiest blows in beating it to death.

Let us now appeal to the teachings of the Protestant Church, to show that in employing the terms in question as applicable to the ministry and church courts, in expounding the word of God, we have strictly conformed to the settled *usus loquendi* of Christendom. This appeal will show: 1. The frequent use of these and similar terms, in the formularies of the Protestant



faith; 2. That they designate a real authority, in the true sense of the word, and show its nature and extent; 3. That they claim this authority, not as inherent in the church as is claimed by the Papacy, under a visible head, but as founded upon the Scriptures and derived from Christ; its essence, nature, and exercise, being held in due subordination to his revealed will.

The last point is the vital one, and will be examined distinctly, after having examined the testimony of the church. We should go to the Scriptures at once and directly, for, as we said in our first article, they "are our first, last, and only conclusive appeal;" but as Mr. Brown affirms so confidently that all Protestantism is against us, we think it important to test his assertions. He says: "It would seem that the claim now set up that 'the church is God's authorized expounder of his law,' did not obtain with the Westminster divines." Again: "The standards of the faith of Protestant churches, so far as we have seen them, not only give no countenance to any such right on the part of the church, or church courts, but most pointedly disclaim and denounce it."

It may perhaps appear that Mr. Brown is not very deeply learned in the lore of the Protestant world. What these standards "denounce" is the impious pretension of the Romish church, which we have seen to be a very different thing from the claim we have asserted. That pretension, confounding it with our claim, he is constantly battling, without perceiving the heaven-wide difference. But what do these standards really say upon the point in hand? We shall give from a few what will serve as a sample for the whole. We are not to be considered as adopting as our own all that these standards set forth, even in the extracts we shall give. The reformers were fallible men, and held some gross errors. But they are the men with whom we are confronted, and we cite them to sustain what we have said. If they go farther, that is no special concern of ours, and in that case we shall turn them over to Mr. Brown. It will be seen that while they accord a real authority to the church, her ministers, and courts, they always present this in due subordination to the Scriptures, the only rule of faith and practice.

The Confession of Wirtemberg, 1552, was presented to the Council of Trent, which declared what was then and is now the

doctrinal faith of the Romish apostacy, and this Confession may therefore be allowed to present the "authority" of the church as viewed by Protestants, in contrast with the arrogant claims of Rome. In Article 32, "Of the Church," eight specifications are given, the last three of which are as follows: "(6.) That this church hath *authority* to bear witness of the Holy Scripture. (7.) That this church hath *authority* to judge of all doctrines, according to that, 'Try the spirits, whether they be of God,' 1 John, iv: 1; and 'Let the other judge,' 1 Cor. xiv: 29. (8.) That this church hath *authority* to interpret the Scripture." After laying down these points thus formally, the Confession explains its meaning more fully. Thus, upon the 6th point, it is said: "This *authority and right*, understand in this respect: that the true church of God, discerning the canonical books of the Scripture from all others, teacheth and defendeth, that nothing is to be added to or taken from the ancient canon either of the Hebrew or the Christian Scriptures." Here, the "authority and right" of the church settles the canon of Scripture. Upon the 7th point, "To this yield with these cautions: That in the judging of controversies, not any judges whatsoever do take unto themselves the name of the church, but \* \* \* judges lawfully chosen; \* \* \* that all controversies be determined out of the word of God alone," etc. Again, in explanation of these several points: "Now that which is affirmed, that the church hath *authority to bear witness* of the Holy Scripture, *to interpret* the Scripture, and *to judge of all doctrines*; it is not to be understood, that the church hath absolute authority to determine what she listeth, and also, if it please her, to change the Scripture, and to feign a new doctrine, and to appoint new worships of God: but the church, as the spouse of Christ, ought to know the voice of her husband, and that she hath received of her husband a certain rule, to wit, the prophetic and apostolical preaching, confirmed by miracles from heaven, according to the which she is bound to interpret those places of the Scripture which seem to be obscure, and to judge of doctrines." This Confession, Article 34, "Of Councils," distinguishes in the same manner, subordinating the "authority" of councils to the Scriptures, in opposition to the pretensions of Rome, thus: "We confess that Councils ought to have their judgments in the church, concerning the holy doctrine of religion, and that

the *authority* of lawful councils is great; but the *authority* of God's Word must needs be the greatest."

Upon the point last mentioned, concerning church courts, the Confession of Scotland, 1560, makes the same discrimination against Rome, in Article 20, "Of General Councils," saying: "But the cause of councils, we mean of such as merit the name of councils, was partly *for confutation of heresies*, for giving public confession of their faith to the posterity following; which both they did, *by the authority of God's written word*, and not by any opinion of prerogative, that they could not err, by reason of their general assembly."

In the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, 1562, Article 20, "Of the Authority of the Church," it is said: "The church hath *power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith*: and yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it *so expound* one place in Scripture that it be repugnant to another." Like all the other confessions, here a real "authority" is ascribed to the church, carefully discriminating against Rome by subordinating it to the Scriptures.

The Confession of England, 1562, though drawn up in the same year, yet not the same as the last cited, in Article 7, upon "Ministers of the Church," says: "We say, also, that the minister doth execute the *authority of binding and shutting*. \* \* \* And touching the keys, wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we, with Chrysostom, say, 'They be the knowledge of the Scriptures;' with Tertullian, we say, 'They be the interpretation of the law;' and, with Eusebius, we say, 'They be the Word of God.' Moreover, that Christ's disciples did receive this authority." The "keys" are the proper *symbol of authority*, not only in ecclesiastical but in secular usage.

All the Confessions speak fully of the "power of the keys," or the *authority* which Christ gave to the church, exercised by her ministers and courts. The Former Confession of Helvetia, 1536, Article 16, on "Ecclesiastical Power," says: "Now the *authority of the word*, and of feeding the flock of the Lord, which properly is the power of the keys, prescribing to all, as well high as low, what to do, ought to be sacred and inviolable. \* \* \* For Christ himself is the true Head of his Church, and he alone is the Shepherd, who giveth governors, pastors and teach-

ers, that, by the outward administration of the keys, *they may rightly and lawfully use that authority.*"

The Confession of Bohemia, 1573, chapter 14, "Of the Keys of Christ," says: "The fourteenth chapter of Ecclesiastical Doctrine is of the Lord's Keys; of which he saith to Peter, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'—Matt. xvi: 19. And these keys are the peculiar function, or ministry and administration, of the power of Christ and of His Holy Spirit: which power is committed to the Church of Christ, and the ministers thereof, unto the end of the world; that they may not only by preaching publish the holy Gospel, \* \* \* but also that to the believing and unbelieving, they may publicly or privately denounce and declare, to wit, to those his favor, to these his wrath; and that to all in general, or to every one in particular: that they may wisely receive some into the house of God, to the communion of saints, and drive others out from thence; and may so, through the performance of their ministry, hold in their hand the sceptre of Christ's kingdom, and use the same to the government of Christ's sheep. \* \* \* And all these things are done by the faithful shepherds of souls in the Lord's stead; not doing this of themselves, but upon Christ's commandment. \* \* \* On the other side, the office and proper work of the keys of Christ is, to shut and bind; that is, by the commandment of Christ, and the authority of this office given by him to the church, which is his power and sceptre, to denounce, &c. \* \* \* This power of his sceptre and spirit hath the Lord granted and delivered to the holy Apostles, and, in them, to all ministers of churches lawfully ordained, that they might exercise it in his stead."

The foregoing are sufficient from the age of the Reformation. Coming down a century later, we find the Westminster Confession, 1647, teaching the same doctrine about church "authority," subordinating it to the Scriptures and discriminating in like manner against the assumptions of the Church of Rome. Chapter 31, "Of Synods and Councils," section 3, says: "It belongeth to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His church; to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same; which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the word

of God, are to be *received with reverence and submission*; NOT ONLY for their agreement with the word, BUT ALSO for the *power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his word.*"

This last testimony is about as explicit a declaration of the "authority" of the church as could well be made in human language; certainly as full and decisive as any one paragraph, or all of them together, found in our former articles, containing also the self-same and the strongest term we used ("authoritatively"), to which Mr. Brown makes such vehement objection, and employing this term in the same sense; and what is to be especially remarked is, that he quotes from this very section of the Confession, and yet says, with surprising complacency: "It would seem that the claim now set up, that 'the church is God's authorized expounder of his law,' did not obtain with the Westminster divines." And he also says of this Confession: "It denies to ministers and courts the right to determine *any thing*, even in ecclesiastical matters, '*authoritatively*;' " when, as it appears, so far from denying this, it says: "It *belongeth* to Synods and Councils" to do this very thing, in this very manner, and expresses "the right" by using the very word which Mr. Brown repudiates.

But this is not all concerning the testimony of the Westminster divines upon church "authority." That body elaborated what is entitled "The Form of Presbyterian Church Government, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines of Westminster," and which was "examined and approved, anno 1645, by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland," in which they say: "Christ hath instituted a government, and governs ecclesiastical, in the church; to that purpose the Apostles did immediately receive the *keys* from the hand of Jesus Christ, and did use and exercise them in all the churches of the world, and upon all occasions; and Christ hath since continually furnished some in his church with gifts of government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto. It is lawful and agreeable to the word of God, that the church be governed by several sorts of assemblies, which are congregational, classical, and synodical." They here use the scriptural term "*keys*" in the same sense in which it is used in all the Confessions, as the *symbol of authority*; and they refer to many texts of Scripture

to prove what they here assert of the "authority" which Christ gave to the ministers and courts of his church, in committing to them "the keys." Thus, citing Matt. xvi : 19, and John, xx : 21-23, they say: "These texts shall be brought to prove that the Apostles did immediately receive the *authoritative power of the keys*, from the hand of Jesus Christ," and citing 1 Timothy, i : 20 ; 3 John, ix : 10 ; 2 Cor. x : 6 ; 2 Cor. xiii : 10 ; they say: "These texts do prove that the Apostles did use and exercise the *authoritative power of the keys*, in all the churches of the world, upon all occasions." After giving these as examples substantiating ministerial "authority" in the church in all subsequent ages, they give specifications of its exercise: "The ruling officers of a particular congregation, have *power, authoritatively*, to call before them any member of the congregation, as they shall see just occasion." They speak of "*authoritative* suspension from the Lord's table;" and as "there was power and authority, under the Old Testament," given to the officers of the church, so "the like power and authority by way of analogy, continues under the New Testament. The ruling officers of a particular congregation have *power, authoritatively*, to suspend from the Lord's table a person not yet cast out of the church ; \* \* \* because it is an ecclesiastical business of ordinary practice, belonging to that congregation." That the Westminster divines here term the "power authoritatively to suspend," involves, of necessity, "the right" *authoritatively to expound the word of God*, or, as the Wirtemberg Confession styles it, "to judge of all doctrines;" for, discipline, even to suspension and excommunication, may be exercised for error in *doctrine* as well as for immorality of life, and of this the rulers of the church are made by Christ the sole judges. The Westminster divines are thus *toto celo* arrayed against Mr. Brown.

There are testimonies almost without number to be found in the seventeenth century which fully sustain the position we have laid down upon church authority. It was an age which produced many able divines, who were more scriptural upon many points of doctrine and government than many of the earlier Reformers. As one of the fruits of the laborious researches of that age, "sundry ministers of Christ within the city of London," published a work which is used as a text book, and is regarded as a standard authority in institutions on both sides of the Atlantic. We give



extracts as a sample of the views held at that time upon the point before us, and might fill a dozen pages of similar testimony. We find the reprobated words we used brought into requisition with great frequency, to set forth the authority of the church, her ministers and her courts.

This work speaks of the "power" of church courts to determine *authoritatively* matters of doctrine and government, as "*of divine right*;" that in these things, lower courts "are subordinate to the greater, *authoritatively*;" that these courts are "not only *suasive* and *consultative*, but also *authoritative* classes and synods, in cases of great importance, difficulty, common concernment;" that as to its "Author or Fountain," this "is a power or authority, *derived from Jesus Christ our Mediator*;" that as to "the special kind or peculiar nature of this power and authority," it is, "1. A *spiritual* power or authority; 2. It is a *derived* power," etc.

Notice, from the same work, the matter about which this authority is exercised. In chapter VII, "Of the several Parts or Acts of this Power," etc., it is said, respecting church courts: "*Authoritative discerning and judging of doctrine, according to the word of God, is a divine ordinance. As that council at Jerusalem authoritatively (viz: by ministerial authority) judged of both the false doctrine and manners of false teachers, branding them for troublers of the church,*" etc. In the same chapter, after speaking of the authority to eject, on account of erroneous doctrine or corrupt life, it speaks of the authority of church courts over the matter of reinstating the penitent: "seasonable remitting, receiving, comforting, and *authoritative* confirming again in the communion of the church those that are penitent." In chapter IX, it is said: "Ecclesiastical power consists of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which are exercised in the *preaching of the word*, dispensing the sacraments, executing the censures, admonition, excommunication," etc. Again: "Church guides can properly discharge the duties of *doctrine, worship, and discipline*, themselves, and ecclesiastically command and compel others to do their duty also." In chapter XIV, "Of the Divine Right of Synods, or Synodical Assemblies," in speaking of the authority of church courts over matters pertaining to both faith and manners, it is said: "The power of synods is *not only persuasive and consultative*, as some think, able to give

grave advice, and to use forcible persuasions in any case, which if accepted and followed, well; if rejected and declined, there is no further remedy, \* \* \* but it is a proper *authoritative juridical power*, which all within their bounds are obliged reverently to esteem, and dutifully to *submit unto*, so far as agreeable to the word of Christ. Finally, this *authoritative juridical power* of synods is three-fold, viz: *doctrinal*, regulating, and censuring. 1. *Doctrinal*, in reference to matters of faith, and divine worship; not to coin new articles of faith, or devise new acts of divine worship; but to *explain and apply* those articles of faith and rules of worship which are laid down in the word, and *declare the contrary errors, heresies, corruptions*. Hence the church is styled 'the pillar and ground of the truth.'—1 Tim. iii: 15. \* \* \* 3. *Censuring power*, in reference to *error, heresy, schism*," etc.; "and these censures exercised, not in a lordly, domineering, prelatical way: but in an humble, sober, grave, yet *authoritative* way, necessary both for preservation of *soundness of doctrine*, and incorruptness of conversation; and for *extirpation of the contrary*. This is the power which belongs to synods."

These citations will suffice to show the views of the Protestant church at the Reformation and in the following century. We might give further testimonies from the men of those times, but it is needless. They agree with that given above; and what we have produced fully sustains our position on church "authority" in our former articles. But all this is of no moment, however completely it may meet and refute the objections of our reviewer, unless we are sustained by the direct testimony of the word of God, the tribunal of final appeal.

Let us, then, consult the Scriptures, to see what "authority," if any, they give to ministers and church courts to expound the word of God, touching doctrine, worship, discipline, etc. "Where can any Scripture warrant be found," inquires Mr. Brown, "for ministers and church courts to set themselves up as the authorized expounders of the divine will? Where is any light promised to them that is not also to each Christian?" We will give the information sought; but let it first be borne in mind that we have never contended for the right of "ministers and church courts to set themselves up" for this or any other purpose, and yet it is quite easy to show that they have been

"set up" for this very object by competent authority, and that all the "light" has been "promised to them" which is required for their work. "A right so important in its nature," continues Mr. Brown, "and so liable to be abused—for it is just that claimed by Popes and Councils, no more, no less—should rest on plain Scripture, and not be left to inference." We agree to this test for the claim, and shall endeavor to make the foundation here demanded for it so "plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it;" but this confounding of the claim with the usurpations of Rome is a total mistake, repudiated by all who insist on this "authority," and shows the writer to be unfamiliar with his subject.

The most general and yet quite specific foundation for this authority, and for the endowments requisite for its exercise, is the ministerial commission which Christ gave, and under which the ministry in every age claim to act. It is recorded by the Evangelists in much the same language, but by Matthew with more fullness. It forms the last words of his Gospel, was delivered just before Christ's ascension, and, with the prefatory statement, is as follows: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshiped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

It is not material to this discussion to enquire whether the Apostles only were present when this commission was given, or whether the whole body of believers was present; for in the latter case, and on the supposition that it was given directly to the church as a whole, all agree that its functions are to be exercised by the ministry, and in this case its authority was bestowed on the officers through and as the representatives of the church; or, in the former case, if given to the Apostles directly, it could not, as all agree, expire with them, for its functions are to be exercised "even unto the end of the world."

We therefore take the following things as conceded: that

this is the general ministerial commission; that it contemplates ministers as an order to be continued in the church to the end of the Gospel dispensation; that it invests them with the functions of preaching, administering the sacraments, taking the oversight of the government of the church, and introducing others into the ministerial office; and that all authority and endowments essential to these several objects, are here given and promised, and are to be continued during every period of the church. The meeting of Christ with the "eleven" at the time and place previously "appointed" (Matt. xxvi: 32, and xxviii: 7,) the bestowal of authority on the ground that "all power" had been given him expressly for the objects mentioned, and the terms employed in the grant, place all we assume beyond doubt.

Substantially the same duties as a portion of those above enumerated, with the authority and endowments essential to them, are mentioned and explained in other passages, and belong to the same general delegation of ministerial power, thus: "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: who soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—John xx: 21–23. Again: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."—Matt. xvi: 18, 19.

These grants of authority are found elsewhere stated in the same words. We need not stop to notice the perversion of the last passage by Papists. Protestants generally agree that these passages are intended to indicate the duties which Christ committed to the ministry of all ages, and to convey the necessary authority and powers for their discharge.

Two questions now arise: What is the authority, if any, bestowed by this commission? What are the endowments, if any, promised for the discharge of the duties imposed? We may view these questions separately, though they are so intimately connected that their subject matter, for the purposes of

this discussion, may be regarded as much the same. Authority, in this case, implies all the essential endowments for its exercise; and so the possession of the endowments here promised presupposed full authority for their use. The one is the complement and warrant of the other.

First, then, what is this authority? In its nature, this is none other than Christ's authority, embodied in his ministers, and executed by them in his stead, and is the same, therefore, as though he acted in person. This is the idea which Paul had of this commission: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." That Christ might be qualified to impart this authority, nothing less than "all power" was given him of the Father for this very purpose. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and teach all nations." It is thus just as certain that the ministry possess full divine authority from Christ to execute every part of this commission, as it is that Christ bestowed any authority whatever upon them for this end by virtue of the absolute "all power" which he had derived from the Father.

The word rendered "power" in the preface to this commission (*πᾶσα ἐξουσία*, *all power*), means here *authority*. It is translated "authority" in nearly thirty places in our version of the New Testament. Two examples will suffice. Where the Roman centurion says to Christ, "I am a man under *authority*, having soldiers under me" (Matt. viii: 9), this word is used; and we know the nature of authority, as embodied in the Roman emperors. It was real, and so far as human authority may be, it was absolute. When Christ preached, the reason given why "the people were astonished at his doctrine," was that "he taught them as one having *authority* (same word), and not as the scribes."—Matt. vii: 29. Where disobedience to the civil authority is spoken of, "whosoever, therefore, resisteth the *power* (authority), resisteth the ordinance of God" (Rom. xiii: 2), it is the same word in the Greek. And not only in the English Scriptures, but in ecclesiastical writings, and in common speech, the words "power" and "authority," though really different, are often used interchangeably. The nature of ministerial authority is therefore unquestionable. In quality, it is, by

delegation, nothing short of the highest authority in the universe; spiritual in its character, and divine in its essence.

In the next place, observe what is demanded of those who are called to the exercise of this authority; or, in other words, notice what are the specific duties of the ministry as set forth in the commission. The present discussion calls us to notice only one of them, but that perhaps a chief one. We would not rashly distinguish where Christ has not, but if any preëminence be allowed, we regard *preaching*, and what is essentially involved therein, as the minister's prime duty. Paul must have viewed his commission in something of this light when he said: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel."

What, then, is preaching? It is to give instruction in divine truth, *by exposition of its meaning*. The prominent idea of the preacher is that he is a *teacher*. This is the duty imposed by the very terms of his commission. Two words used in it show this. The command is: "Go, *teach* (*μαθητεύσατε*) all nations."—Matt. xxviii: 19. The word here rendered "teach," is used in but three other places in the New Testament, and in two of them it has reference to instruction in Gospel truth, and in the other it is used concerning a disciple who had been so instructed.—Matt. xiii: 57; Acts, xiv: 21; Matt. xv: 57. The other word is: "*Teaching* (*διδάσκοντες*) them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."—Matt. xxviii: 20. The word here rendered "teaching," is used in some form nearly one hundred times in the New Testament, and always conveys the idea expressed in this passage, that of *teaching* the truth, or of *teaching* error, and is in every instance rendered in our version for the one or the other.

Preaching is thus essentially giving *instruction* in divine truth, by developing its meaning; and this is something more than the public reading of the word of God. It involves of necessity, *exposition, interpretation, application*. The ministerial commission gives full authority to do these very things; these are the very things which by its precise terms are commanded to be done; an order of men have been called by Christ and set apart for this express purpose; the doing of these things is of the very essence of their authority; and anything which falls short of this manner of preaching does not meet the demands of this commission, either in letter or spirit. When, therefore,



this part of the ministerial work is done in accordance with Christ's will, it is done in the highest possible sense "authoritatively;" and as the ministry are bidden, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," it follows that "every creature" who hears the truth thus preached, in any nation, tribe, or tongue, is bound to give heed to it as the word of God, under peril of the divine displeasure. Ministers are thus "the authorized expounders of the word of God."

We are now prepared for the inquiry: What are the special ministerial endowments, if any, for this important work? As exposition of the truth is the chief duty of the ministry in the matter of preaching, as the benefit to be received from it depends in a great measure upon the correctness of such expositions, and as the Scriptures expressly declare that the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit is essential in any and every case to a clear and correct understanding of the truth (1 Cor. ii: 14), it would seem to be a little remarkable if Christ had not given the ministry, by promise or otherwise, any special endowment for this chief part of their work, called and set apart as they are for the special duty of instructing all mankind in the way of salvation. Reasoning *a priori*, we should conclude that such endowment were a moral necessity, that the ministry could not accomplish the purpose of preaching without it, and we should expect to find, on searching the word of God, that the requisite aid had been provided.

The grounds on which such a presumption is founded, and which, on examination, we find sustained by the facts, are: 1. The Spirit's influences are bestowed upon individuals, ordinarily for their individual benefit; but they are given to the church as an organized body, for the benefit of all men. 2. The vast mass of mankind are in ignorance and sin, and therefore can not claim the guidance of the Spirit, while the members of Christ's own body need constant instruction that they may "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" hence the ministry are appointed expressly to instruct the church in this "knowledge," and to "teach all nations" the truth. 3. The organization of the courts of the church, is, in a great degree, for her own benefit; but their functions, for this end, are not less for her guidance in true doctrine than in holy life, and indeed the one is essential to the other.

Assuming each of these points to be true, and that the ministry and church courts in executing their several functions are to be guided by the Scriptures as their standard, and that the word of God can be understood only by the teachings of the Spirit, there seems to be, we repeat, a manifest necessity—perceivable antecedently to any direct knowledge of the fact—that the “church as such,” in her ministry and courts, should be especially endowed by the Spirit, that she may accomplish her mission. The duties she has to fulfill, as an organization, through her teachers and rulers, are vastly greater and more varied and difficult than those which devolve upon any individual simply for himself. For them she needs higher endowments of the illuminating and guiding Spirit. Is there, then, any foundation for the position that the church possesses such endowments? We need not distinguish specifically what is said of the ministry as “teachers” and as “rulers,” or what is declared of the church as an organized whole; for under whichever of these forms the Scriptures speak on this point, they are to be understood of what is promised to the body of Christ as a public visible organization.

For an answer to the inquiry immediately before us, let us first revert to the ministerial commission, as given by each of the Evangelists. When Christ sent forth the ministry to “teach all nations,” Matthew records him as saying: “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” This is always understood of the presence of the Holy Ghost, called elsewhere “the Spirit of Christ,” and was promised not merely for the personal comfort of the ministry, but to witness to, aid in, and sanction, their official work. When Luke speaks of this commission, he gives these words of Christ, referring to the Holy Spirit: “Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” John refers to this endowment, in connection with Christ’s sending forth the ministry, giving his word: “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.”

That these passages all refer to the same persons—the ministry sent forth under the general ministerial commission—is universally conceded. What, then, is the purport of these several declarations of Christ about the Holy Spirit? It will not do to say that they have no reference to the ordinary, per-

manent ministry, but relate merely to the endowments of the Apostles. If we may say that the special aid of the Spirit for the official work of this commission as promised in the record of Matthew was not to be permanent, then we have no ground to conclude that the commission itself is permanent. The same reasoning which would destroy the permanency of so material a part would destroy the whole. But not only is the commission permanent, as all agree, but this part of it is permanent, and therefore the promise of the Spirit is permanent; for "the end of the world" means, as long as the Gospel shall be preached, or to the end of this dispensation. Nor may we say, that, because the Apostles were endowed with miraculous powers of the Spirit, as at Pentecost, referred to in the passage from Luke—powers which have ceased, being confessedly for a temporary purpose—therefore the ministry are not to enjoy and have no promise of any special endowments of the Spirit whatever, for a permanent work. In some important things the apostolic work was totally different from that of the permanent ministry, and hence the Apostles had miraculous powers. When their extraordinary work ceased, the extraordinary endowments for it also ceased. But this furnishes no reason to conclude against special endowments for the ordinary ministry. The work in the two cases being dissimilar, the endowments may be dissimilar, and still those which the permanent ministry possess may be special and peculiar to their order, though miraculous inspiration has passed away. There is no need of thus confounding the cases, nor is there any conflict between them. But besides this, the gift of the Spirit spoken of in John, whatever its measure or quality, was actually bestowed before the Saviour's ascension, and is not therefore to be confounded with the effusion at Pentecost. It was bestowed at the moment of announcing the commission, thus: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Undoubtedly this was an accomplishment of the promise made in this commission as given in Matthew—one recording the promise and the other its instant fulfillment; the accounts of the two Evangelists thus making up the complement of the Saviour's words touching the one event—without in the least conflicting with the miraculous

endowments referred to in Luke, and fulfilled at Pentecost after the Saviour's ascension. This shows perfect harmony between these three Evangelists upon this feature of the commission, while it appears that Mark, though giving the other points of the commission, makes no mention of the Spirit; but his omission does not affect what is directly stated by the other three. It is thus as certain as any thing recorded in the Scriptures, that, in the commission, under which the ministry of all ages are authorized to preach the Gospel, is contained both the promise and a declaration of the actual bestowment of special endowments of the Holy Ghost for their work.

We may then note the progress of the Gospel in the early stages of its career for illustrations of this power. When its first preachers went forth under this commission, we find that the Spirit witnessed with their teachings, *in specially enlightening their minds*, not only in the new truths of the new dispensation, but upon the written revelation which the church had in its possession during the previous ages. Nor was this special endowment for preaching confined to the Apostles, the extraordinary order, who had extraordinary powers, and a temporary mission to fulfill. Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, who were not of the Apostles, with many others, were thus endowed.—Acts, vii: 55; viii: *passim*; xi: 24; xv: 4. The primal cause of these special endowments was that these preachers might *rightly expound the truth, interpret the written word of God*, as well as make known other truths, and thus meet the demand of the commission to “*teach all nations*” the way of life.

If it be said that the power of the Spirit by which these first preachers under the new dispensation were aided was truly miraculous, and belonged to them as inspired men, we reply that it would be difficult to show that all who were then aided by the Spirit to preach were endowed in this higher sense, or had any higher aid than that promised to the ministry in every age, except in the proclamation of entirely new truths. But we may safely admit that all the preachers of the apostolic age were thus truly inspired, and that this was essential to the complete establishment of the infant church. But it is a most violent *non sequitur* from this, that the ministry of subsequent ages, acting under the same commission, in which is promised the same Spirit, for the same end, are to enjoy no measure of

these special endowments. This makes the words of Christ of none effect: it nullifies one of the material parts of the commission, and, in effect, destroys the whole.

And besides this—on the admission supposed—observe how the true and full inspiration of all the preachers of the apostolic age affects the present argument. If a proper inspiration was needed to enable them to understand, so as to expound aright, *the Old Testament Scriptures, a written revelation*, much more do the ministry now need the special endowments promised to enable them to expound a written revelation, when they can lay no claim to such inspiration. The measure of aid which we claim to be permanently promised for the same end is at least as important now as a much higher measure was then, otherwise it would not have been made permanent. The difference is not essentially in its *nature*—though we by no means deny such difference—but in its *degree*. These early instances may therefore well illustrate what is promised in that commission under which all Christ's ministers act.

For further illustration, observe two particular instances where the early preachers of the Gospel, not of the number of the apostles, were specially aided by the Holy Spirit to understand, in addition to the Old Testament Scriptures, *the words of written revelation, as found in the New Testament* (precisely the case of the ministry now), *so as to be able to preach its truths to others*. They are found in the instructions of Paul to Timothy and Titus, whom he styles, the one his "own son in the faith," and the other his "own son after the common faith," and both of whom he had probably introduced into the ministerial office. They are injunctions upon ministerial duty. Paul says to Timothy: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, *keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us*." "And the things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."—1 Tim. vi: 20; 2 Tim. i: 13, 14; ii: 2. An eminent scholar, commenting on Paul's meaning in these passages, remarks: "The thing committed in trust to Timothy, which the Apostle was so anxious that he should guard, and

deliver to faithful men able to teach it to others, was the true account of our Lord's character as the Son of God, his descent from Abraham and David, his birth of a virgin, his doctrine, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, and his return to the earth to raise the dead and judge the world. Now, as these things, at the time the Apostle wrote this epistle, were all faithfully recorded in the writings of the Evangelists, and were foretold in the writings of Moses and the prophets, these inspired writings were, without doubt, a principal part of the deposit committed to Timothy, to be kept by him, and delivered to faithful men able to teach others. Farther, as the Apostle in his sermons and conversations had explained to Timothy many passages, both of the ancient Scriptures and of his own writings, these interpretations were to be kept by him, and followed, in all his discourses and exhortations to the Ephesians and others."—*Dr. MacKnight, in loco.*

That "the things" which Timothy was to "keep" were the great doctrines of gospel faith here mentioned, and that they were to be kept "*by the Holy Ghost,*" so that he might be enabled properly to preach them to others—"to faithful men who should be able to teach others also"—are stated in the Apostle's own words. That these doctrines, at the time Paul wrote, were reduced to a written form by the several Evangelists, is an undoubted historical fact; and that these Scriptures of the New Testament, including Paul's "own writings" and his other instructions, as well as the Scriptures of the Old Testament, were "a principal part of the deposit committed to Timothy" as a minister, all which he was enjoined to "*Keep by the Holy Ghost,*" in order that he might be aided to preach the truth, and committing it to "faithful men," to be kept in like manner, that they might "teach others also" by the endowments of the same Spirit, are matters concerning which there is no ground for disagreement. It follows, then, upon the testimony of the Apostle, in the light of these facts, that Timothy enjoyed just those special endowments of the Holy Spirit which were promised in the commission to the ministry of every age, and for precisely the same end—to enable him to understand the great doctrines of salvation which had been reduced to the form of a written revelation, so that he might properly preach them to others.

The other case referred to is found in a corresponding passage in Paul's instructions to Titus, concerning the qualifications of those whom he should introduce to the ministry: "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."—Titus, i: 9. The Apostle does not mention here, as in Timothy, that "the faithful word" is to be held fast "by the Holy Ghost" which dwelt in him, but this is of course implied.

These cases thus illustrate the exact condition of ministers now, who are faithful to the demands of their commission; they may have the special aid of the Holy Spirit to enable them to understand *a written revelation*, so as to declare the truth *authoritatively* "to every creature."

The point to which we have already adverted, as an objection which might be made by some—that these are instances of inspired men—would, even if admitted, only serve to make the argument all the stronger for the position we maintain. There is, however, no proof that Timothy and Titus were inspired, in the sense that the Apostles were. Why should Paul instruct them in regard to their ministerial duties, if they were equally inspired with himself? The fact that he did thus instruct them is a clear proof that though he was inspired, they were not; for it is absurd to suppose one man would attempt to teach another, where both had equal claims to inspiration. Timothy and Titus were not of the college of the apostles; they had no apostolic powers; they were simply preachers of the new dispensation, having, so far as we have any certain knowledge, no higher endowments for their work than those promised in the commission given to all true ministers of the Gospel. But, as we have said in regard to the other instances referred to in the Acts, admitting that Timothy and Titus were truly inspired, and had all the higher powers of the Holy Ghost which the Apostles enjoyed, and that it is to these that Paul refers in regard to the "trust" which they should "keep by the Holy Ghost;" then we say that these admissions only make their case an argument in our favor, showing the absolute necessity in even a stronger light for what the promise provides; for, if such extraordinary gifts were *essential to enable them, as preachers, to understand the written revelation of the Old*



*Testament*, and as much of the *written revelation of the New Testament* as was then reduced to that form, then, *a fortiori*, much more do the ministry now, *for the same purpose*, need at least the special endowments promised in the general ministerial commission. So far, therefore, as the present discussion is concerned, it really matters not what may have been the quality or measure of the endowments bestowed on these early preachers. Take either view of their spiritual gifts, and their case fully sustains and illustrates the position for which we contend—that the faithful ministry of every age have the promise and may enjoy the special aid of the Holy Spirit, in such measure as is neither promised nor bestowed upon any in the church for any less purpose, to enable them to understand the truth that they may expound and proclaim it to others with saving effect.

We now present some illustrations of the actual exercise of “authority,” by both ministers and church courts, in expounding the word of God, under the special endowments of the Holy Spirit for this end, which may serve as examples for ministers and church courts of the present day.

The first is found among Paul’s instructions to Titus. After mentioning certain subjects for his preaching, he says: “These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke, *with all authority*,” *μετὰ πάσης ἐκτεταγῆς*.—Titus, ii: 15. There would be no more sense in supposing the “authority” with which Titus was enjoined to preach, was to be confined to him, as peculiar to the man, or the subjects mentioned, or the time, place, or age, in which he lived, than in supposing Paul intended a similar restriction to be put upon the words with which the next verse opens: “Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.” These injunctions, it is agreed by all, both preceding and following the verse under consideration, declare the duty of ministers in this and in every age. The same must be admitted of the “authority” with which Titus was enjoined to preach. What, then, was this authority? The word *ἐκτεταγῆ* occurs but seven times in the New Testament. In each of the other six places it is translated, in our version, “commandment.” One is found in this same epistle, where Paul speaks of himself as a preacher: “But hath in due times manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the *command-*

ment of God our Saviour."—Titus, i: 3. Again: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the *commandment* of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope."—1 Tim. i: 1. When speaking of "the preaching of Jesus Christ," Paul says: "But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the Prophets, according to the *commandment* of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of the faith." Rom. xvi: 26. In the other three places (1 Cor. vii: 6; vii: 25; and 2 Cor. viii: 8); the Apostle had "*no commandment* of the Lord."

The "authority" which Titus was thus to display in preaching, was no empty thing, when the same writer, in every other instance in which he uses the word by which he expresses it, calls it "*the commandment of the everlasting God.*" Be it observed that the Apostle does not mean by "authority" in this place, that Titus was to regard himself as a duly authorized minister—duly instructed and otherwise qualified and properly ordained, concerning which of course there could be no doubt—but that his *preaching* was to be "with all authority." This plenary "authority" was to enter into the essence of his *doctrine*, in matter and manner, so that he could declare it as the real truth of God, so that those who heard him should be obliged so to regard it, and so that he could demand obedience to it as such.

Take another example, showing ministerial "authority" and the duty of the people under its exercise: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you."—Heb. xiii: 17. Here are three words, one expressing *authority*, and the other two enjoining *obedience*. The word rendered "obey," is *πειθεσθε*, from *πειθω*, which signifies "to bind or tie, in order to lead; to turn, conduct," etc. It is used negatively in Gal. iii: 1, and v: 7, in precisely the same manner in both places: "that ye should not *obey* the truth." The nature of the obedience spoken of in Heb. xiii: 17, is illustrated, so far as the use of the same word now may do it, in James, iii: 3, "Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may *obey* us; and we turn about their whole body." The word rendered "submit," is used no where else in the New Testament. It is *ὑπεικete*, from *ὑπεικω* compounded of *ὑπο*, under, and *εικω*, to

*yield*. It undoubtedly has its correct meaning in our version, in this place. The word rendered "rule," is ἡγουμένοις, the whole phrase being, *πειθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν*, and meaning literally, "Obey the ruling of you, or your rulers." The participle here used is from ἡγεομαι, meaning "to lead, guide, teach, instruct; to preside, govern," etc. The noun ἡγεμων means "a leader, guide; a chief, ruler, governor, prince," etc. Both the substantive and verbal forms, coming from the same root, are used many times in the New Testament; the former, once in the plural, translated "princes" (Matt. ii: 6), and in every other instance translated "governor" or "ruler," either singular or plural; the latter having a variety of translations in our version, but always embodying the idea of "authority." Two instances of the latter, besides the verse in question, are found in this same chapter, as verse 7, "them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God;" and verse 24, "Salute them that have the rule over you, and all the saints." In both these verses, as in verse 17, under consideration, the participial form of the verb is used, the only difference being in the case.

It is thus clear that this passage teaches a real authority in the rulers of the church, and demands a corresponding subjection on the part of the people; the authority being nothing less than that of Christ, the Head of the universe, delegated to his ministers; and the obedience being nothing less than that which he himself demands, and to be rendered to them as unto him. The passage can mean nothing short of this.

The only question which remains, concerning Heb. xiii: 17, if indeed there can be any raised at all, respects the things embraced in the authority there given to "rulers;" that is, the matters about which the authority is to be exercised. It is plain that it covers *doctrine, worship and government*, for all these are committed to ministers and ecclesiastical rulers. We say nothing here upon the specific authority of church courts, as such; that point is still in reserve. But assuming at present that there are such courts, or even individual "rulers," then this passage can embrace nothing less than what we have stated; for the whole matter of *doctrine and worship*, in preaching, teaching, expounding, catechising and conducting all the service of the sanctuary, whether in the prayer meeting, Sunday

school, or the great congregation, comes under the authority of the "rulers" of the church as truly as the specific matter of *discipline*. But if any suppose that this passage has reference to discipline particularly, or indeed wholly, it will not in the least affect the argument from it in favor of ministers and "rulers" being "the authorized expounders of the word of God," as we claim. Discipline in the strictest possible sense of the term, may be exercised upon one or both of the things, corruptness in *doctrine* and corruptness in *life*; as truly upon the former as the latter, and with equal authority. There is nothing upon which the whole church is better agreed than this, both in principle and practice. Take any actual case, then, of discipline for corruptness in doctrine. Ministers and people alike may be arraigned for this. They may be admonished, suspended, excommunicated, and if ministers, deposed from office. If, then, there be any tribunal competent for this, recognized by the Scriptures—whether the congregation among Independents; or the session, presbytery, or synod, among the Presbyterians; or the bishop, among Episcopalians—that tribunal must, from the nature of the case, as the London divines style it, be concerned in "judging of doctrine," in order to determine whether error really exist; and if so, to judge of the gravity of the case, and the grade of punishment required; and when this is determined by the court of last resort, the decision is final; and the sentence which follows is irrevocable, unless the error is renounced and repentance is shown. If the decision degrade a man from his office, or cut him off from the church, or both, it may involve the most serious consequences, oftentimes to reputation, character, and peace, and not unfrequently, from the deprivation of office, may take from him and from his family the means of worldly support; while none of these consequences would be in the least obviated by the most persistent plea of sincerity in the exercise of what Mr. Brown terms "the inalienable right of private judgment in all matters connected with the Christian Scriptures," secured to "the Protestant world" by the "Reformation of the sixteenth century." All this is unquestionably within the *authority* of the "rulers" of the church, and results from no other principle than that they are "the authorized expounders of the revealed will of God." On no other principle could the church be main-

tained as an organized body for a moment, except upon that of allowing its ministers and members to preach, believe, and act, as each one should see fit. This might suit the advocates of "Broad Church" views, but would not be the type of the church of Christ as given us in his word.

For the next case in illustration of "authority," let us analyze that of a court of the highest type representing the church at large, acting upon a matter referred to it for adjudication, the whole essence of which was concerning *doctrine*, involving as it was viewed by some, nothing less than the soul's salvation. It will thus illustrate by actual example the principles laid down in the verse last examined, Heb. xiii: 17. It is found at large in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. The case was this: certain men taught that circumcision was essential to salvation: the matter was discussed in the church at Antioch, where they "had no small dissension and disputation;" Paul and Barnabas with others were appointed to "go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Elders about this question;" on convening the court, made up of this description of rulers, "the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter;" like church courts in all ages where important subjects are canvassed, there was "much disputing," in which Peter, Paul, Barnabas, James, and others took part; at length, just as in modern courts, they came to a decision, which in this case at least we presume was correct; this decision was put into written form, and sent forth for the observance of all the churches, those in "Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia," being specially mentioned, "which are of the Gentiles;" when "the epistle was read," containing the decision, the people of all the churches "rejoiced for the consolation;" and as the result of the whole matter, this "authoritative" decision of a church court, "the authorized expounders of the word of God," upon a great doctrine of the Christian faith, to which the people were required to submit, was followed by a general revival of religion, which is thus noticed: "And as they went through the cities they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily."

The points made in this narrative, so far as they are essential

in this discussion, are very simple. We take for granted what seems to lie upon the surface of the whole proceeding: that this was a church court of a representative character, which made a decision upon a vital matter of doctrine, for the observance of the churches at large. The main questions in hand, are two: 1. Was the decision "authoritative," as regarded both by the court and the churches at large? 2. Is this case an example for us of the present day? Although some things in this narrative have been much controverted, there is general agreement upon the two points in which alone we are now concerned. But we will examine them briefly.

1. Was this decision *authoritative*?

The matters embraced in it, are called "necessary things," and a "burden," thus: "It seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these *necessary things*," βάρος πλὴν πῶν ἐπ' ἀναγκῆς τούτων.—Acts, xv: 28. The word here rendered "burden," means an onerous endurance, or heavy weight: "Which have borne the *burden* (βάρος) and heat of the day."—Matt. xx: 12. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal *weight* (βάρος) of glory."—2 Cor. iv: 17. The word rendered "necessary" (ἐπ' ἀναγκῆς), is used in no other place in the New Testament. It is compounded of ἐπὶ, upon, and ἀνάγκη, necessity, or "compulsion, force, obligation, whether actual, moral, or religious." The subject matter decided, was thus a "burden" which must be borne, and embraced things of "necessity;" it constituted, therefore, a command, and involved an obligation in the very highest sense *authoritative*.

All this further appears, when we examine the nature of the edict in which this decision was published to the churches, and the manner in which it was received by them. Embracing several things, it is called, in the plural, *decrees*: "They delivered them the *decrees* for to keep," φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα.—Acts, xvi: 4. The word rendered "*decrees*" is used in but four other places in the New Testament, and always means an injunction of the most positive and binding nature. In two of these instances it is applied to the edicts of the Roman emperor: "There went out a *decree* (δόγμα) from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."—Luke, i: 1. "These all do contrary to the *decrees* (τῶν δογμάτων) of Cæsar."—Acts, xvii: 17. There can be



no debate whether the "decrees" of the Roman emperors were "authoritative." They always required unconditional obedience. In the other two instances this word is applied to the positive ordinances of God: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in *ordinances* (*δόγμασι*) for to make," etc.—Eph. ii: 15. "Blotting out the hand writing of *ordinances* (*δόγμασιν*), that was against us."—Col. ii: 14. The Jewish "ordinances" here referred to, having been established by God, were of the most obligatory nature, upon the judgment, heart, and conscience. The same word (*δόγμα*) is used in several places in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, to represent the "decrees" of the kings of Babylon.—Dan. ii: 13; iii: 10; iv: 3; vi: 8.

We are then brought to the conclusion concerning which there can be no question, that in the use of a word implying absolute moral necessity, to set forth the subject matter of the decision, and in the use of a word expressing authority requiring unconditional obedience, to publish the result arrived at to the churches, the court rendered a judgment which was in every sense "authoritative." The people on hearing the decision, not only acquiesced in it, "but rejoiced for the consolation" it gave them. It was, therefore, regarded as "authoritative" by those who made it and by those for whom it was made; by the court, and by the church at large. "The truth is," says Mr. Brown, "theological *dogmas* settle nothing." But on the contrary, it appears that they are the very things which do "settle" vital questions. The "dogmas" of this court determined for the people of the whole church an essential matter of doctrine concerning the terms of salvation.

2. Is this case to be taken as an example for "authority" in a church court in any succeeding age?

Several matters are here involved. 1. Is it said that they decided by virtue of their endowments as *inspired* men? If so, any one of the apostles could have settled the dispute at once. Inspiration utterly precludes the idea of consultation and discussion. It is a direct divine impulsion. When inspiration is the power at work it is said: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 Pet. i: 21. If inspiration had been the requisite, Paul could have decided the mat-



ter alone, without going up to Jerusalem. 2. Is it said that the reference to the Holy Ghost in the narrative (Acts xv: 28), shows that inspiration was employed? But it is said: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, *and to us.*" Such a conjunction is never spoken of where inspiration is concerned. It is men who speak or write, but the whole essence of what is uttered is directly from God; yet here, the Spirit and men are joined in a way to indicate that while the men were acting on the light which they gained from the several speakers, who referred to the Scriptures for authority, they were simply enjoying, for their understanding of these Scriptures, those endowments of the Spirit promised by Christ to the rulers of the church in every age. To make any such mention of themselves, when inspiration were the power in action, would be but little short, if any, of blasphemy. 3. Not only the apostles, who seem not to have assumed any apostolic authority in any way whatever, but also "the elders" (verse 6), were concerned in the consultation and decision; and "the brethren" (verse 23), "with the whole church" (verse 22), seem to have been employed in spreading the knowledge of these "decrees," and thus aiming to put the decision into execution. 4. When all the elements of the case are considered, there is the strongest ground for the conclusion in which all branches of the church agree, that, in regard to the decision of this court at Jerusalem, "it must have been the design of God, in not ordering *one* to make it, to set an example of ordinary ecclesiastical proceedings for all succeeding ages."

It would be easy to fill pages showing that the most distinguished men in the church agree in the view of this court at Jerusalem. Indeed, upon the only two points essential in this discussion—that this was an *authoritative decree*, and that the case is an example for the church *in all ages*—there is well nigh if not entire unanimity of sentiment. Says Dr. Smyth: "The decision which was thus made was *authoritative*, extended to all the churches, and was sent down to them, and read in them;" and he cites this case on purpose to show the "Scripture warrant for such an assembly of the rulers of the church" in every age.—*Ecc. Cat., in loco.* Dr. McLeod, in a work which has passed through several editions on both sides of the Atlantic, presents this case as an example for the higher church

courts of all times and countries, and says: "This is an *authoritative decree*, enacted by a representative assembly exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction over churches and presbyteries."—*The Chr. Church, in loco.*

The London divines, in the work already referred to, examine this case at great length. Of the sending of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, they say: "Here was an *authoritative mission* of delegated officers." Of the composition of the body: "The elders and brethren who are as *authoritatively* members of the synod as the apostles, did, in all points, as *authoritatively act* as the apostles themselves." Of the decision: "Here are several *authoritative* and juridical *acts of power* put forth in this synod;" and, "here are plainly juridical, *authoritative* constitutions;" and they declare it a "judgment of *authority*." Against the position that the case may have been decided by the apostles, as inspired men, or in some way in their apostolical character: "Here all the members of the synod, as they were convened by like ordinary authority, so they acted by like ordinary and equal power in the whole business laid before them; which shows it was an ordinary, not an extraordinary synod. For though apostles and evangelists, who had power over all churches, were members of the synod, as well as ordinary elders, yet they acted not in this synod by a transcendent, infallible, apostolical power, but by an ordinary power as elders." Again: "Here is now an ordinary way of proceeding by debates, disputes, allegations of Scripture, and mutual suffrages. What needed all this, if this had been a transcendent, extraordinary, and not an ordinary synod?" Of this being an example for all times, they say, when speaking of the discussion in that assembly: "If this had not been to have given a pattern to succeeding ages, all this was unnecessary. How absurd for inspired men to reason and dispute on a subject, when the sentence of one inspired was sufficient for the decision. \* \* \* \* The pattern of their practices" in this and in many other cases in apostolic times referred to, "must be a rule for all succeeding churches." And finally, in regard to the statement, "It seemed good to the *Holy Ghost and to us*," they take the ground that any court now might adopt it with propriety, guided by the Spirit, as Christ promised, and being governed by the Scriptures, thus: "Which

words, any assembly, having like clear evidence of Scripture for their determination, may, without presumption, use, as well as this synod did."

We may now announce some general conclusions from the whole discussion thus far. The foregoing expositions of Scripture, illustrated by the opinions of eminent men of the church, result in establishing the following propositions:

1. For the public preaching of the Gospel, the ministry, as an order of men, possess an authority from Christ, and have the assurance of special endowments of the Holy Spirit, to aid them in expounding the Scriptures for the instruction of "every creature," which belong to no other persons. They are always, therefore, to preach "in his name," and by his authority; and when, under the guidance thus provided, their preaching is conformed to the Scriptures, it is in the highest possible sense "authoritative," and the people are required to receive the truth they proclaim as the very word of God, and to render obedience thereunto, on pain of his eternal displeasure.

2. The courts of the church which Christ has appointed have a like assurance of spiritual aid for expounding the word of God, and are always to act "in his name" and by his authority upon matters of both doctrine and life respecting members of the church, their standard, as in preaching, being the Scriptures: and when so conducting, their decisions are in the highest possible sense "authoritative," possessing a sanction directly from Christ, which can be claimed for the acts of no other persons for the same ends; and it is the duty of the people to render obedience to them as unto Christ.

The length to which this article has extended forbids our pursuing the subject further at present. It is by no means exhausted, although the proposition upon which alone we have now written—that the church, by her ministers and courts, is "the authorized expounder of the word of God"—we think is fully established. This being so, objections to it, however plausible, are impotent for its overthrow. There are points, however, made against it in the pamphlet of Mr. Brown, which require notice. They may be reduced substantially to two: How can such a proposition be consistent with what he terms "the inalienable right of private judgment?" How can the church be invested with this authority,

unless there be perfect agreement in her views? These two questions will dispose of what remains upon the main branch of the subject we have here discussed. One other proposition—the chief or rather the only one treated in our two former articles, and which Mr. Brown assails—we have not entered upon at all in this. It concerns *the range of subjects* which the church may entertain by her ministers and courts. These several points, each and all of them having an intrinsic importance aside from the immediate occasion which has here called them up, may be examined hereafter.

---

ART. II.—THE NATION'S SUCCESS AND GRATITUDE. *The Substance of a Discourse delivered in Danville, Ky., on the 26th of November, 1863, the day of National Thanksgiving and Prayer.*

At the close of one of the most remarkable passages of the Word of God the great Apostle of the Gentiles exclaims, "*Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!*"—1 Cor. xv: 57.

Let no one suppose that the manner in which I apply these words, and use the exalted sentiment they convey, is a wresting of the Scripture. For the image of the supreme triumphs immediately alluded to is taken from the triumphs which men and nations win concerning the things of this world; and all of them, of every kind, are gifts of God through Jesus Christ our Lord; and whosoever obtains them, whether they be temporal or eternal, will find them fruitful only in proportion as he renders back to God gratitude and love. And God, who gives us victory, whether over sin and death and hell, or whether over ourselves and over the world, and over his enemies and ours, will make the victory itself complete, and our fruition of it consummate, in proportion as we win it in his name, and use it to the glory of his grace. For it is to him that *overcometh* in the work upon which God has set him, and in which the Lord Christ is his leader, that the glorified Redeemer will give to eat of the tree of life; it is to him he will give a crown of life; it is he who shall eat of the hidden manna, and receive power over the nations, and his name shall stand in the Book of Life; he it

is who shall be a pillar in the temple of God, with the name of God, and of the city of God, and the new name of the son of God, written upon him; and to him, saith Jesus, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my father in his throne.

To thank, to praise, and to bless God therefore, for every mercy he bestows on us, as, on the other hand, to humble ourselves before him at every hiding of his face from us; is the constant duty of every one of his dependent, rational creatures. And in proportion as the mercies are special and signal, or the calamities and dangers great and pressing, should the thanksgiving or the humiliation be earnest and particular; fasting and confession being the appropriate accompaniments of our humiliation; praise and rejoicing in God, in like manner, being parts of our thanksgiving; and earnest prayer to God, indispensable to both. These solemn duties stand so high, in the judgment of God, that he has established them as perpetual ordinances, constant as to their divine obligation, occasional as to the times and seasons of their special celebration. It belongs to each individual to determine for himself, so far as the special celebration of these ordinances of God appertains to matters wholly personal to himself. It belongs to the head of each family to determine concerning his own household, in like manner. It belongs to the tribunals of the church of God to determine the times and seasons proper for their observance by the Christian congregations and people under their care. But it appertains, also, to the civil magistrate to recommend to the people of any community of which he may be chief, to sanctify unto God special days and times, in the fitting recognition of God as God, and as their God and Redeemer, in the reverent and hearty observance of these institutes of Christ's kingdom in this world. This belongs to the civil magistrate, because he is not only the temporal head of the people, whom he ought to guide in the way that is pleasing to God; but, especially, because he holds his place, first by the ordination, and secondly by the providence of God; and because thus distinguished of God, he is moreover the servant of God in that place, and the minister of God for special ends revealed in his word; the sum of which is, that the people may be kept from the wrath of God on account of their sins, and that they may be partakers of

those blessings which mankind can receive only through the knowledge of the living and true God.

Thus it is with a full authority derived from their office, and ordained of God, that the Governor of the commonwealth of Kentucky and the President of the United States, in concert with the chief magistrates of many other States, have set apart this day, and invited the people to observe it as a day of public and special thanksgiving and praise to Almighty God for the many signal mercies we enjoy in the midst of our present deplorable condition of civil war; and also as a day of special prayer to God for the continuance and increase of these tokens of Divine favor, unto the complete deliverance of the nation from its present danger, trouble, and temptation. And so we are now gathered in the house of God, in concert with the thousands of God-fearing men and women throughout this commonwealth, and the many tens of thousands throughout this nation—to praise and magnify the name of God, to pour out our hearts in thankfulness at his mercy seat, and, with earnest love, to make loud and high recognition of his wonderful works and ways of judgment and justice and goodness; beseeching him, by every plea he has put into our mouths, to continue to this great and free nation—as unto a living and perpetual monument of his own glory—all that loving kindness and infinite protection, for which we now call upon all that is within us, to exalt and bless and adore him! So shall we be brought, in triumph, through our present sore troubles; and in God's good time and way, the heavy calamities prepared for us, shall be swallowed up in victories given to us by him.

As we participate in this solemn and acceptable service, with full consent and preparation of heart, let us especially remember, amongst the many things to be deeply pondered concerning ourselves, those that follow, as being too important to be passed over, with slight consideration. In the *first* place, it is the high privilege of the followers of Jesus Christ, the sons and daughters of God Almighty, to come with great confidence to his throne of grace. A believing, penitent, loving people find favor where their divine Redeemer sits at the right hand of the majesty on high; and their praises and their supplications go up with acceptance in the ears of the Lord God of Hosts. Therefore, let them beware that the things for which they



thank and praise God are really things which God has done; and let them beware that the things for which they pray are things right in themselves and acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. And so, in the *second* place, remembering the abounding iniquity which surrounds us on every side, defiling so much the very instruments which God uses in our deliverance, and profanely seeking union in the very favor which he shows his people; let us beware of any fellowship before God with such works of darkness, doubly jealous of ourselves, lest we go before him with the taint of the filth of his enemies upon us and the idols of reprobates in our hands. God is to be praised for all that he is, and all that he does; and it is only the pure in heart who shall see him. It is heathenism that uses its God to bring its own carnal desires to pass. Wherefore, in the *third* place, all we offer and all we ask should be in a deep sense of our own insufficiency in all respects; and with strong desires that our will may be swallowed up in the will of God, and that his infinite wisdom and goodness, and not our manifold errors and imperfections, shall be the rule of his dealing both with us and with our country. For they are the circumcision, saith God, which worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. And the service which most becomes the children of God, is that they offer themselves a living sacrifice unto him, which he will make holy and acceptable.

One more step in the direction indicated by all I have said, places every one imbued with the spirit of such an occasion as this, in a position where the particular subjects of his thanksgivings and supplications are as clear, as I have endeavored to make the spirit in which those acts of worship should be performed. God has made our duty so plain, that he calls it a highway, and a way of holiness, and declares that wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. We have in our hands the complete revelation of his will, wherein he has made known to us all that belongs to our present salvation and our eternal blessedness. The sum of it all, and therefore the whole duty of man, as God himself explains, is that we fear God and keep his commandments. And the meaning of that is, as God declares, that having shown us all good, what he requires of us is to do justly, to love mercy, and walk humbly with our God.



And, in addition to his blessed word, we are surrounded continually by his adorable Providence, so that we absolutely live and move and have our being in him. It is from the person of the Lord Jesus, who is alike the only head of his church, the head over all things and the sum of the revelation of God, that all providence takes its rise since the creation of our universe, and that the course of all providence is developed. It is true, that, in the widest sense, the providence of God is from eternity, and over all things in every other universe there may be besides this of ours; and will reign over all, after this episode of our universe, and sin and redemption shall, so far as time shall exist to measure it, have been swallowed in the infinite dispensation of God. Nay, the whole dispensation of salvation for lost sinners of the human race, by the Son of God, is a great act of the providence of God. It is also true, that, by reason of our weakness and blindness, and the shortness of our lives on earth, and the small portion we behold of God's infinite providence, we are liable to be always taken by surprise, and often to deceive ourselves concerning the significance of those acts of God, of which he had revealed nothing to us in advance. But this is hardly more than must be said of the plainest revelations of God, concerning which, that men resist, evade, and pervert them—there are innumerable proofs always before our eyes. Still, it is none the less true that God's word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path—that the Spirit of God is with us, crying, This is the way, walk ye in it—and that the crucified Redeemer calls to us evermore, follow me. And in like manner, the Providence of God, unrevealed till it reveals itself, and unsearchable as to its whole significance, becomes to us as it develops itself, often a general, and oftener still a topical commentary of Christ himself, upon his own teachings and commands. To-day, with the word of God in our hands, and the wonderful providence of God toward us and our country during the past three years, open to all men; the special mercies, pertinent to our present condition, for which we should thank and praise God, and the particular blessings, relevant to our immediate future, for which we should implore God; seem to me to be capable of the most precise statement.

In proceeding to make such a statement, exactly responsive to the whole current of what I have now said, it is well to

remind you that it is now within a few days of three years since the President of the United States then in office (Mr. Buchanan), struck, perhaps, with the impending ruin of his country, for which very few were more deeply responsible than himself, made proclamation of a day of national humiliation and prayer, with open confession, on his part, that there was no remedy for the vast and accumulating national perils but the direct interposition of God. It had been better if he had taken the divine rebuke to a far better and greater man, under circumstances far more desperate: "Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward!" The Lord heard the supplications of the people; but not to the intent indicated by their chief magistrate. The war he dreaded, came; but the ruin he connived at, came not. Almost three years of war, well nigh unparalleled for the extent and cost of it, as well as for its possible effects, bring forth this day of national thanksgiving, responsive to that day of national humiliation. Called in providence, without any procurement of my own, to point out the duty of our country then, I find myself, in like manner, called to point out its duty now, under a change of circumstances so remarkable. No clearer exposition could be given of the difference between the condition of the country at the two periods, than a just comparison of the two proclamations of the two Presidents. What falls to us now is to fill up this portentous gap in our national career by recounting briefly, and in order, the chief intervening acts of God's providence toward us, which make this day, so justly, what it is; pointing out at the same time, that these are among the very mercies most relevant to every purpose of our present national appeal to the throne of God.

In the *first* place, there is ground of fervent and everlasting thanks and praise to God that he kept back the nation from giving any just cause for any part of the enormous wickedness which has been perpetrated. Legal pretext for breaking up the nation, there was none whatever. But even if it could be supposed possible for the right of the legal destruction of the nation, at the caprice of a portion of it, to exist either by nature or otherwise, it is perfectly certain that no national act had ever been performed that would justify the smallest approach toward the exercise of such a caprice. On the contrary, since the

foundation of the world, there never existed a supreme government, which ought to have been less liable to serious complaint on the part of those subject to it, much less to wide-spread insurrection and open war, than the Federal Government was during the long course of years that traitors were secretly conspiring to destroy it, than it was at the moment the Southern states seceded from it and took up arms against it. Now, let any human mind attempt to form a somewhat adequate conception of the misery and ruin that have been inflicted, and of the sin that has been committed, in the attempt to consummate the original wickedness of this attempt to destroy this great Republic. Let it be remembered that all this incalculable guilt and suffering had for its original justification no pretext that would excuse a private person for causing another even a moment's uneasiness. Yet it is all to be accounted for at the bar of God! To speak of nothing else, they who are responsible for this terrible war, and the frightful slaughter which has attended it, must answer to God for every drop of human blood that has flowed in torrents along its cruel track! That which God would not pardon, was that Manasseh had shed innocent blood till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Behold I am bringing such evil upon Jerusalem and Judah that whosoever heareth of it both his ears shall tingle! I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down! Whatever may be the judgment of God, in the world to come, upon the authors of such crimes, it requires no seer to reveal that God is bringing the curse of blood-guiltiness upon them in this life. Who shall impeach the righteous judgment of Jehovah? Who in the survey of such a course of Providence, and in the knowledge of the divine record it is illustrating, is not ready to call upon his soul, and all that is within him, to bless God that he has kept us back from doing aught to provoke iniquities so abominable in his sight?

In the *second* place, there is abounding cause of gratitude to God for the manner in which he has stirred up the hearts and guided the course of the loyal population in every part of the country, in the terrible ordeal through which they have been led. Taken by surprise, seduced by diabolical deceits, or overpowered by sudden force, the faithful population in the seceded

states were still a source of weakness to the insurgents; their cruel oppression operated as a constant stimulant to the national efforts for their deliverance; their presence in the revolted states afforded the surest means of restoring society, after the rebellion should be crushed; and the tens of thousands of them who coöperated with us, as soon as they had opportunity, added continually to our strength. In the border slave states, all of which were embraced in the scheme of the revolt, and all of which have been already secured to the Union, the hand of God has been more manifest, perhaps, than any where else. At first, every thing, in all of them, wore the most threatening aspect to the national cause; and they have suffered by the war many fold more than all the Northern states; large portions of them to an extent that is frightful. But, through the constant blessing of God, the steadfast courage of the loyal people, sustained by the prompt co-operation of the border free states and the vigor of the Federal Government, has constantly and now finally triumphed over an almost perpetual Confederate invasion, combined with the treason of, probably, half of their own aggregate population. Of the course of events in Kentucky especially, with which I have been familiar from the beginning, I feel assured that any just consideration of what has occurred, from the complete triumph in 1859 of the party which has furnished the bulk of our domestic traitors, up to the present time, will reveal a course of providential interpositions as well calculated to fill us with awe as with profound gratitude. The Northern states met the great crisis with a universal uprising of heroic patriotism, hardly surpassed in the history of the human race. And if, in the unsatisfactory aspects which our public affairs have sometimes put on, disloyal factions have arisen, the providence of God has broken them to pieces. And if untimely party spirit has sought ignoble success, even at the risk of the degradation of the country, the providence of God has brought such base attempts to open shame. And now, as if to rouse and unite the nation to give one final and crushing blow, a great demonstration of resolute support to the Government comes, attended with the horrible cry of thousands of our brethren systematically starved to death as prisoners of war, while thousands of insurgents, our paroled prisoners of war, are captured afresh, fighting against us! It is as if God would rebuke

us for allowing space for an hour in which such unparalleled dishonor may be practised, and such atrocious cruelty may be perpetrated! It would hardly be a marvel to see the whole nation hurl itself against the barbarians, who cause the people they rule with a rod of iron to revive crimes long since banished from the earth!

In the *third* place, we ought to come before God, with his awe and his dread upon us, as we magnify his great name for his goodness towards us, in confounding all the counsels of the chief leaders of this insurrection—defeating all their expectations—and turning their wickedness to their own destruction. In one thing posterity will remember with respect this insurgent population—they have generally fought well, often with heroic courage. But even in this praise—which we are glad they merit, as it redeems in some degree a people of our own blood—few or none of those who are conspicuous in leading them to destruction have any part. The traitors most conspicuous in the detestable conspiracy which preceded the revolt, and in the organization of the insurrection when it broke out, and in the violence and fraud which marked it from its birth, have been conspicuous also in the diligent practice of the great duty of self-preservation. As statesmen, as leaders of a great revolution, as financiers, as diplomatists, as any thing on which success of any kind depends—if it be not that God has confounded them—there is nothing to redeem them from contempt. They would establish a new and immense empire, whose corner stone should be laid in African slavery: and they proceeded to the execution of their vast design, in the only way by which it was possible for African slavery among themselves to be destroyed—the only way in which it was certain that the immense region that they already possessed, could be completely desolated. They would make the whole commerce and capital of the world tributary to their designs, by means of their control of the cotton market of the world; and they speedily succeed in reducing their population to a condition rapidly approaching want—hurrying the country they governed into irremediable bankruptcy, and forfeiting forever the greatest agricultural monopoly ever possessed by any people. They would separate forever from the United States, as from a nation that had lost its freedom, and was degrading its civilization; they would prohibit all intercourse with their former fellow-

citizens, whom they pronounced the basest of mankind; they would condescend to do all this peaceably, on terms the most insolent and preposterous, if reverently accepted at their dictation; otherwise they would chastise the Yankees into submission, make Washington the seat of their empire, establish slavery in favored portions of the North, and hold the rest in subjection. And so on through all the phases of a self-conceit exalted into phrenzy, and an audacious insolence unrestrained by principle or common sense. God blowed on them: and what now, for the realization of their insane attempts? What woe to us—what woe to the world—if they could have accomplished even a small part of what they proposed to themselves! What thanks are due to God for frustrating designs pregnant with folly and wickedness, and unmixed with a solitary chance for good?

In the *fourth* place, God has stood by us in a wonderful manner throughout all the vicissitudes of the great war, upon the issue of which depended, not only our national prosperity, glory, and independence, but our national existence as well; and for this, as it is the most palpable manifestation of his providence, so it should receive the most distinct and grateful recognition by us. War of itself, like pestilence and famine, is always a calamity—a calamity springing directly from the depravity of the human race. But, like pestilence and famine, it is an instrument which God employs in the course of his adorable providence; and from which, as from all evil, it is his divine prerogative to bring forth good. And so great is the good brought out of it by God, that little exists on earth worthy to be possessed, that is not held, first or last, by the blessing of God upon stout hearts and strong arms in the day of battle; and that no race or people ever did anything for the glory of God, or the advancement of human kind, who shrunk from maintaining by force whatever God had given them, or from achieving by force whatever God required of them. Of all wars, bloody insurrections are the most desolating, the most offensive to human reason and to the majesty of God, and the most certain to fail of their design; and as of all insurrections not one has ever been more bloody, more desolating, more causeless, more abominable than this. The unshaken conviction of all God-fearing loyal men, from the beginning, that it must utterly fail, has, at every



step, been vindicated as just, and realized as true. Within less than three years our valiant troops have overrun, subdued, and occupied more than half of the immense territory, more than half of the states, claimed by the insurgents; and in doing this have reduced, by more than half, the power of the insurgents to carry on the war, and have rendered their design of dividing the Republic by force, on the slave line, and erecting the fourteen slave states into a new nation, forever impossible. And now we are many times more competent to do what remains, than we were at the beginning to do what has been done; and the insurgents are many times less competent to offer effectual resistance than they were at first. Well might the President say, "No human council hath devised, no mortal hand worked out these great things." And what remains for us is to take new courage as we see new proofs that God is with us, and do what remains of our great work as those should do who are guided by the hand of God. But remember that God is a jealous God, and we are a sinful people. Not for thy righteousness, said he to his ancient people, or for the righteousness of thine heart dost thou go to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee. And, in another place: I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for my own name's sake.

In the *fifth* place, we owe to the God of all grace and mercy peculiar thanksgiving for that he not only made all things work together for our good, in our own land, but also embraced us in the acts of his providence concerning foreign and distant nations, bounding and limiting and ordering the things which vitally concerned the greatest of them all, so that we have been constantly delivered from great and impending danger. There were two prominent dangers to which our country was exposed. The first was, that while the nation was wholly unprepared, the Confederate leaders, who had the whole period of Mr. Buchanan's presidency in which to reduce our means of prompt defense to the very lowest point, and to exalt their own means of attack to the very highest; should rapidly concentrate the whole military strength of the insurgent states and hurl it, in immense masses, upon the wavering border states, and through them into the very heart of the nation. They had a million of fighting men; one half of that force, perhaps one-third of it, thus



used, at the proper moment, presented in reality the obvious and certainly the only possible chance of success. They could not do it, or they did not see it; they lost the great occasion; and their destruction, if they were unaided, remained only a question of time. The other great peril was the intervention of the great commercial nations of Europe in their behalf. This they confidently expected; and it is probable that when all the secrets of their conspiracy are laid bare, it may appear that their leading men had better reasons to expect decisive military aid, both from Great Britain and France, than for their clamorous folly about the sovereignty of cotton. I shall not, on this occasion, array the proofs of the manifest intention of both those great nations, persisted in up to a very recent period, to secure the independence of the Confederate States, if that could be done without too great risk to themselves. Few enlightened men in this country have any doubt on the subject. I shall not stop to show that the recent favorable change in the conduct of both of those nations, toward the United States, produced in part by the manifestation of our power and in part by the threatening state of European affairs, is probably worthy of little reliance any longer than the events which produced the change remain to confirm it. Nor can I now recount the circumstances of that immense and increasing European agitation, which took its rise since the commencement of our civil war; which may speedily convulse all Europe in a manner far too deep to render it convenient for either France or Great Britain to provoke a war with the United States at present. But what I wish to point out is, the hand of God in our deliverance, even if it were but temporary, from this second of our chief perils, by delivering us from the combined menace of France and England, and possibly from war with both, as allies of our insurgents. In this age, nothing is more certain than that nations that would be free must be powerful. That God has given to this nation a glorious mission, which is not yet accomplished, it were mere atheism to deny. That having done so, however he may chastise us for our sins, or purge us by suffering unto greater fitness for our destiny, that he will withhold those acts of his almighty providence, which are needful for our national preservation, is beyond conception. That he will not, let the events I have feebly recounted, and which involve a deliverance so sig-

nal and so opportune, satisfy our hearts and fill our mouths with praise.

In the *sixth* place, God is greatly to be praised for the spirit of a sound mind, which by his grace and providence has constantly increased in the loyal people of the United States, enabling them to see more and more clearly, the supreme duty of preserving the integrity, the supremacy, and the independence of the Republic; and confirming them, more and more, in the determined purpose to perform that duty. This result is the more remarkable, as we reflect on the manner in which the infinite mass of confused opinions has worked itself out, and cleared itself up, to the distinct and almost solitary test and purpose: *the insurrection must be put down, absolutely and at whatever cost.* And it adds to the importance and efficacy of this result that it cost, in thousands of cases, the most heroic sacrifice of feeling; that it was reached, in thousands of others, against temptations as strong as were ever overcome; that it has been adhered to by all in full view of the immense sacrifices it would require, and that not even mistakes of great gravity, and errors full of danger, on the part of those in whose hands is the immediate fate of the country, have shaken for an instant the unalterable purpose. The question of negro slavery, for example, in its relation to the insurrection to the Federal Government, and to the future pacification of the country, has furnished the severest test of this sublime loyalty that could be imagined. And therefore, while I can not, at this time, argue any part of it at large, its immediate relation to the subject before me and to this whole occasion, as well as proper respect for public opinion, and perhaps I may add, for myself, forbid my passing over it in silence. I will therefore observe, in the first place, that traitorous slaveholders everywhere are destitute of any right or just authority in any national decision concerning this subject: because they perfectly understood that they risked their slaves as well as their lives upon their fatal revolt, and because by their treason they have laid themselves justly liable to the forfeiture of both. In the second place, I observe, that as the people of this country have never sanctioned the use of the Federal Government as an instrument to extend or to perpetuate negro slavery, so, I am persuaded, they never will approve the use of it as a direct instrument in its extinction. In the meantime, all

men and parties, who, on the one hand, oppose the permanent pacification of the country until and unless negro slavery is first abolished; and all men and parties, on the other hand, who resist that pacification, until and unless negro slavery is accepted as a permanent element, are equally and alike mere factions, out of sympathy with the nation and perfectly certain to be finally repudiated by it. For myself, whenever this question is forced upon me, no one who remembers that, in 1830, I sought to open the way to a system of gradual emancipation, under the old Constitution of Kentucky, by proving the legal power over the after born; no one who remembers that, in 1850, I sought to have a system of emancipation engrafted on our present State Constitution: can, for a moment, suppose that after the immense progress of free opinions in the interval, I am likely, for the sake of negro slavery, to risk the triumph of the nation, or to give countenance to proceedings or opinions which tend directly to a collision between the Government of Kentucky and that of the United States. On the other hand, I made public in 1862 my objections to the special policy of the present Administration touching this vast and difficult subject, even before the final proclamation of the President was issued. What the final issue as to the black race may be, depends, first, upon the future course of the insurgents themselves; secondly, upon the future course of the Federal Government; and, thirdly, upon the future decision of the people of the United States; neither of which can be known at the present time. Thus far the temper of the nation, and especially of loyal persons in the slave states, seem to me to be as I have stated; and I judge it to be a temper eminently the product of that spirit of a sound mind, manifested in so many other ways, for whose wide existence we are called on to thank God. No nation ever occupied a situation, in which it was more important that every species of fanaticism should be banished from its councils and its conduct, and every tendency toward disloyalty denounced and put down.

In the *seventh* and last place, the only remaining topic I will suggest, as demanding our special thanksgiving to God, is that, amidst all the shocks which the nation has received, and all the turmoil of a great and bloody civil war, and all the rank corruption of the times, he has kept the great body of the people

sound at heart concerning those great principles of liberty and free government, which lie at the base of all our institutions, and which are the fruits of the longest and most effective political training ever enjoyed by any portion of mankind. I know there is an incessant clamor to the contrary by all who are in sympathy with the principles of the insurgents, and that this clamor is taken up, to a certain extent, by many who are classed in a kind of general and qualified way with the supporters of the Union and the National Government. There is, undoubtedly, a wide distinction, in ordinary times, between a government considered of itself and the body of civil magistrates who administer that government. But when the nation is arrayed in battle, and the existing magistracy represent alike its civil and its military existence, habitual clamor against their honest—even though, in some respects, improper—endeavors to secure the triumph of the republic, far more resembles sympathy with its enemies than patriotic jealousy for constitutional liberty. The safety of the state is the supreme law. And though this great rule of public duty may be abused by wicked magistrates, the rejection of it for the purpose of giving security to public enemies is the direct way to destruction. War is for the protection of nations, not for the protection of traitors and insurgents against them. And when life, the supreme gift of God to men, is forfeited by crime, what rule of reason or of morality requires special care to be taken of the personal liberty of those whose whole endeavor is to destroy public liberty, or heedfulness of the personal and property rights of those whose business is to kill us and destroy all we possess? When this clamor degenerates into an outcry against the Government, on questions of the neglect of mere forms of proceedings, and the non-observance of purely technical, civil ideas, in dealing with justly suspected traitors, by way of military police in the midst of desolating war, it is not easy to forget who has taught us that the habit of straining at gnats is usually the indication of power to swallow camels. There is no rule whatever, either of reason, or morality, or religion, that requires the public enemies of the state to be treated before the civil law as if they were its friends; nor do the Constitution and laws of this country, or of any other, secure to rebels, and those who aid and comfort them, the rights and immunities, either as to form

or substance, which belong to peaceable and loyal citizens. To allege, on such grounds as are constantly urged, that the Federal Administration is corrupt and tyrannical; that the laws are thereby set at nought, and the Constitution subverted; that the submission of the nation to such proceedings is proof of its own incapacity for freedom; and that, as the general and terrible result, we are already in subjection to a military despotism: is proof only that there is a party in the country which abuses the forbearance of the Government and the patience of the people, and insults the providence of God. If every word they say was as true as it is false, the citizens of the republic who are in arms for its defense, would, before laying those arms aside, restore the liberty, the laws, and the institutions of their country. What is true, theoretically, of every country, and of every form of government, is also true practically with us. The community, by its very nature, and by the express ordinance of God, is altogether superior to any possible form of government, by means of which its national life is held forth. Our present Constitution is our present means of manifesting our national existence and desires. Our fathers made it; it has served the most glorious purpose for us; we love it, and intend to maintain it. But we were a nation before we made this Constitution. And before we were a separate nation, we were free Britons—a part of an empire already glorious. And when we separated as a nation from that empire, it was a constitutional monarchy; before that it had been a kingly oligarchy; before that almost a despotism; before that, six hundred years ago, it was a feudal monarchy. And all these changes came by convulsions. But all the time, Britain was Britain. And all the time, for nearly a century, America has been America, under whatever form of political institutions. And, by the blessing of God, free America shall be free America forever, under whatever form of free constitution, this one, or any other one, it shall please her unconquerable people to create! And, from the bottom of my soul, I thank God for every proof that this heroic and long-descended temper of the people abides in all its strength.

Having now presented some of the special grounds pertinent to this peculiar occasion, on which the united thanks and praise of all loyal and God-fearing people throughout this

nation are due to God, I will very briefly point out the corresponding blessings, specially relevant to these grounds of praise, for which they who thus rejoice in God should offer their supplications at his throne of grace.

We ought implore God that he would give to us, and to every one like-minded with us, great grace, wisdom and courage, that we may be enabled to stand in our lot, and, come good or come ill, quit ourselves like men unto the uttermost. That he would, of his great mercy, give grace and sense to the disloyal men and women scattered over the land, and mixed with the loyal people, to see the great wickedness and danger of the principles they cherish and the practices they encourage, so that they may repent thereof and turn to a better way. That he would confound the counsels and break the endeavors of all open rebels against the life of this nation which God has set up and enlarged, and against its government which God has ordained, and so show his wonderful compassion to them as to keep them from perpetrating all further mischief, and to turn them from their dreadful sin and folly. That he would so order, in his great goodness, that all in authority amongst us may be kept from every evil way, and from every purpose unworthy of the great necessity laid upon us, and the great end set before us, so that complete triumph and lasting peace may be speedily secured for us, by means which God will own and bless. That God, having fitted the nation for complete success, and having given that to it, would incline and enable all men to walk in such ways of wisdom, justice and humanity, that all the results of this frightful struggle shall turn to the glory of his adorable name, and that the evils of these troublous times may pass utterly away, and return no more forever, while the good that God will bring out of them, both to this republic and all the inhabitants thereof, and to the world, may be a perpetual inheritance, to his endless praise, through Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world.

It is in the light of eternity alone that the real importance of all these things to us, considered as individual persons, can be duly estimated. It is not as they tend to make us miserable or make us content; to reduce us to want or fill us with abundance; to strip us of freedom or confirm our liberties; to exalt us very high or reduce us very low; but it is as they tend to



wean us from the Lord Jesus, or to lead us to a more perfect conformity unto him, and a higher service and enjoyment of him, that they are all of supreme significance to us. To keep ourselves aloof, when God is shaking, not the heavens only, but the earth also, may be to separate ourselves from him, who is overturning all things that can be shaken, in order that his people may inherit all that can not be moved. And one of the most mournful aspects of the sins and miseries with which this insurrection has polluted the land, is the phrenzied participation which thousands who profess to be ministers of Christ, and tens of thousands who profess to be his followers, have had in originating it, in sustaining it, and in applauding it. Nevertheless, the kingdom of Messiah will purge itself, and survive and triumph, and Messiah, the Prince, will vindicate to himself his dominion over all things; and they who put their trust in him shall never be confounded. While hypocrites and apostates perish in their sins, we may trust that the deluded children of God will be saved as by fire, and we know that the faithful witnesses for Christ will be brought off conqueror, and more than conqueror, through Him who loved them and gave himself for them. To Him be glory in the highest!

---

ART. III.—BAPTIST REVISION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. *Review of "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The common English version, corrected by the Final Committee of the American Bible Union."*

ABOUT thirty years ago, the managers of the American Bible Society refused to aid in the circulation of certain versions of the Holy Scriptures in the Bengalee and Burmese tongues, for the reason, that the Greek equivalent for the word *baptize* was translated in those versions, by a word corresponding to the English "immerse." Most of the Baptist members of the Society immediately withdrew, and formed the American and Foreign Bible Society. The new association carried within itself, the germs of further dissensions. Many of the influential members urged upon it the duty of revising the English scriptures, especially in the places where the word *βαπτίζω*, or any one of its cognates, is employed. In the year 1850, the



Society determined that it would continue to issue the common version, without alteration or revision. The dissatisfied minority united with others in the establishment, May 23, 1850, of the American Bible Union. The avowed object of the Union, is "to procure and circulate the most faithful versions of the Sacred Scriptures, *in all languages*, throughout the world. The italics appear in the constitution of the Union, and are significant. The Bible Revision Association was established in the city of Louisville, in 1853, for the purpose of coöperating with the American Bible Union. The adjective *Revision* is also significant. In point of fact, both of the societies last named, have hitherto given their attention mainly to the thorough revision of the English version of the Bible. In the volume, the title of which stands at the head of this article, the public receives the first fruits of the labors of these brethren, in the shape of a revision of the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and the first three Pauline Epistles.

The preliminary controversy which this subject has occasioned is at an end. What are the imperfections of the common version; whether they are as numerous and as serious as has been alleged; whether they can all be corrected by a strict translation, as distinguished from a critical gloss or an exegetical addition to the text; whether, in the present state of the English-speaking churches, throughout the earth, it is possible to supplant the common version by any revision whatever; whether, in point of scholarship, the world is ripe for so great a work; whether our Baptist brethren can command the mature and final culture necessary to its accomplishment; and whether the entire English race is likely to accept from the "Final Committee of the American Bible Union" any revision as of supreme authority, are questions which it would be useless now to discuss. Most of them have been thoroughly considered, and so far as they have been left undetermined, they must be turned over from the logic of debate to the logic of events. The merits of the new revision, and the validity of its pretensions to the exalted position now held by the common version, are the only points in the case that remain to be examined.

The more learned members of the Bible Union understood from the beginning, what was not so well known, perhaps, to

the mass of their supporters, that a double labor was to be undertaken. Not only was a faithful translation, in all respects, of the original scriptures to be produced, but as preliminary to that, the Hebrew and Greek text were to be revised. The text of the Greek scriptures, especially, has never been conclusively settled. The second Elzevir edition of the Greek Testament, published in Leyden in 1633, contains what is called the *textus receptus* or the "received text."

This text has been repeatedly examined by modern scholars, and the results of their labors appear in the various readings which are printed in all the critical editions of the Greek Testament. Now the revisers, employed by the Bible Union, have undertaken to determine the value of all these various readings, and, in fact, to prepare a new and final *textus receptus*. The formidable character of this undertaking can be appreciated only by those who have given attention to this branch of sacred learning. The Greek text is derived, first, from about thirty MSS., written in the uncial or capital letter, the oldest of which is assigned to the fourth century, and the most recent to the ninth or tenth century. The first four of these, commonly distinguished by the first four letters of the alphabet, are the oldest copies. Next, about four hundred and fifty MSS., written in small or cursive letters, have been collated. These are assigned to the period running from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries. Again, the New Testament exists in several ancient versions, some of the oldest of which are the Itala and the Syriac Peshito, made in the second or third century, and the Latin Vulgate, by Jerome, toward the close of the fourth century. Finally, large extracts from the New Testament are found in the writings of the Latin and Greek fathers. By the use of these materials, a critical apparatus has been constructed, exhibiting in one view all the various readings. The number of the readings, noted by Griesbach, has been estimated at one hundred and fifty thousand. Scholz, who collated nearly double the number of MSS. examined by Griesbach, swells the number, so it is said, to nearly three hundred thousand. It should be added that hardly one in a thousand of these variations affects, in the slightest degree, the real sense of Scripture. They consist, for the most part, of words differently spelled, letters changed or

omitted, or doubled, the interchange of numbers, tenses, and synonyms, and such like. And it should be added again that not one of the remainder attacks any fact or doctrine vital to the revelation. Yet, in order to the restoration of the authentic Greek text, all these readings must be examined, and their value carefully determined. Now, in the judgment of the best biblical scholars, the time has not yet come for the final revision of the original text, and the settlement of the many difficult points involved. An enlightened writer in the *Quarterly Review*, London, for January, 1863, presents the following judicious survey of the present state of this science:

“Supposing that a new *textus receptus* is required to embrace the results of recent inquiries, is the time yet arrived when we can venture to undertake the work? Have sufficient materials been accumulated? Bring to textual criticism the same logical principles which we apply to physical science. Have we not learned the peril of setting forth theories of geology, while geology is in its infancy? Is not comparative criticism still in its infancy—its laborers few—divided—not always to be trusted in the accuracy of their observations, avowedly partial in their theories, some of them suspected in their tendencies, none of them capable of commanding, even if it were desirable that they should command, unhesitating acquiescence in their authority? There are three sources from which the Greek text of the New Testament must be derived—manuscripts, versions, and quotations in ecclesiastical writers. *Has any one of these been adequately examined?* Is the authority of unical texts a settled question? Is the rejection of cursive texts finally decided on? Is the real credit due to any particular codex fixed or capable of being fixed? Does not the whole field of inquiry present, except in a very few instances, only a conflict of probabilities and hypotheses? Such appears to be the opinion of the soundest and most judicious inquirers, notwithstanding all the invaluable labor that has been bestowed upon the subject within the present century by Matthæi, Alter, Birch, Griesbach, Scholz, Hug, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Davidson, and Scrivener. The nucleus of Divine truth is firm and solid; its verge is still surrounded with a halo.”

The Bible Union has abandoned the well-chosen and conservative position taken by this writer. Its exigencies were

immediate and urgent. It had undertaken "to procure a faithfully revised version of the English Scriptures;" to that end the ancient Greek text was indispensable. But one of the prime necessities of the Society was haste. It could not allow the revisers in its service to imitate the patient industry of the older scholars; of Wetstein and Griesbach, who devoted the best part of their lives to the work; of Scholz and Tregelles, who spent many years upon the text, in toil and travail; of Tischendorf, whose unwearied industry in the discovery and publication of a single manuscript is so well known to the present generation. The Bible Union would not circulate the common version *ad interim*; and could, therefore, do nothing towards spreading the word of God, in our tongue, until the revision was finished. Doubtless it expected the work to be well done, but then here was an emergency in which, "'twere well 'twere done quickly." *Si possis, recte, si non, quocunque modo.* As early as the thirteenth year of the existence of the Union the Final Committee have been able to agree on a new *textus receptus* of the Greek and a thorough revision of the English text. It is not unreasonable to suppose, however, that before the religious public will acquiesce in the authority of the Committee, they will require information on two points: first, what changes in the former *textus receptus* have been made? and, secondly, what are the grounds on which these changes are proposed? These points are now to be looked into. But it should be stated here that our inquiries will be limited to the revision of the Four Gospels. Part II, containing the Acts and the Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, did not come into our hands until the materials for this review had been collected, and so arranged as to occupy all the space that can be given to the subject in these pages.

The amendments which the revisers have made in the Greek text of the Four Gospels, adopting our translation as the standard of comparison, are very numerous, approaching, if indeed they do not exceed, two hundred. These may be reduced to four classes. A few leading examples in each of these classes appear below.

1. Words and phrases are added to the text. We print the words so added by the revisers in *italics*. Luke, xv: 17, "How many hired servants of my father have bread enough and to

spare, and I perish *here* with hunger." John, xix: 3, "And *they came to him* and said, Hail King of the Jews." John, xx: 16, "She turned herself and saith unto him, *in Hebrew, Rabboni!*"

2. Words and phrases are removed and others supplied. Matt. xix: 17, Instead of the words, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God," the revisers read, "Why dost thou ask me concerning good? one is the Good." Mark, ii: 7, "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies?" The revisers read it thus, "Why does this man speak thus? He blasphemeth." Mark, xi: 10, "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord." The revisers change the Greek, so as to read: "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David." Some amendments belonging to this class are simply suggested in the margin. Matt. xxi: 31, "Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first." Here the marginal note is, "*In the oldest copies: they say to him, the tardier one.*" Luke, xiv: 5, "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit," etc., the marginal note is, "*In the oldest copies: whose son or ox.*"

3. Several important passages are marked as suspicious. Matt. xxiii: 14, "Woe unto Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses," etc. The note is, "v. 14 is wanting here, in the oldest copies; it belongs to Mark, xii: 40, and Luke xx: 47."

Mark, xi: 26, "But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven forgive your trespasses." This verse is dismissed with the note, "v. 26 is omitted in some ancient copies."

Luke, xvii: 36, "Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left." Note, "v. 36 belongs in Matt. xxiv: 40; it is omitted here in the oldest copies."

Luke, xxiii: 17, "For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast." This receives a broader condemnation: "v. 17 is omitted in all the oldest and best copies."

John v: 3, 4, "In these lay a multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, [waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water. Whosoever then, first, after the troubling

of the water stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever disease he had]. Here the pointed suspicion is breathed out, in italics, thus, "vv. 3, 4. *The words in brackets are wanting in the oldest and best copies.*"

John, viii: 1-11. This place contains the story of the woman taken in adultery, and the memorable interview between Christ and the Pharisees touching her case. The entire passage is enclosed by the revisers in brackets with this explanation: "The words in brackets are wanting in most of the ancient copies." Upon that naked statement the suspected verses are left to perish out of the page of holy scripture.

4. Certain portions of the received text are rejected by the revisers, as spurious. The attention of the reader is not called to these erasures by any note or comment in the margin. It is the more necessary, therefore, that a few, at least, of these should be distinctly pointed out. The following selection has been made out of a very large number of cases that have been noted. The Greek words struck out by this revision of the text are indicated below by their English equivalents in brackets.

Matt. v: 44, "Love your enemies, [bless them that curse you. Do good to them that hate you,] and pray for them which [despitefully use you, and] persecute you."

VI: 4, 6, 18, "Thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee [openly.]"

VI: 13, "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: [For thine is the kingdom and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.]"

XII: 35, "A good man out of the good treasure [of the heart] bringeth forth good things."

XV: 8, "This people [draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and] honoreth me with their lips," etc.

XVI: 3, "[O ye hypocrites] ye can discern the face of the sky."

XVIII: 29, "And his fellow servant fell down [at his feet,] and besought him saying, Have patience with me and I will pay thee [all.]"

XX: 7, "He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; [and whatsoever is right that shall ye receive.]"

XX: 22, 23, "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of [and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?] They say unto him we are able. And he saith

unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup [and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with]: but to sit," etc.

XXIII: 8, "But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master [even Christ] and all ye are brethren."

XXV: 13, "Watch, therefore: for ye know neither the day nor the hour, [wherein the Son of man cometh.]"

XXVI: 60, "But found none,—[yea] though many false witnesses came, [yet found they none]. At last came two [false witnesses] and said," etc.

XXVII: 35, "And they crucified him, and parted his garments casting lots: [that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet. They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.]"

Mark, ii: 17, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners [to repentance.]"

III: 5, "Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored [whole as the other.]"

IX: 24, "And straightway the father of the child cried out and said [with tears, Lord] I believe," etc.

XIV: 22, "Take [eat] this is my body."

XIV: 70, "Surely thou art one of them, for thou art a Galilean, [and thy speech agreeth thereto.]"

Luke, iv: 18, "he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me [to heal the broken hearted,] to preach deliverance to the captives," etc.

IV: 41, "And the devils also came out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art [Christ,] the Son of God."

VI: 10, "and his hand was restored [whole as the other.]"

VI: 45, "and an evil man out of the evil [treasure of his heart] bringeth forth," etc.

VIII: 48, "And he said unto her daughter, [be of good comfort,] thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace."

XI: 2-4, "[Our] Father, [which art in Heaven,] hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. [Thy will be done as in heaven so in earth.] Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation, [but deliver us from evil.]"

XVII: 4, "and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day and seven times [in a day] turn again," etc.



XX:30, 31, "And the second [took her to wife, and he died childless.] And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also; [and they] left no children and died. Last [of all] the woman died also."

XXII:64, "And when they had blindfolded him they [struck him on the face and] asked him, saying," etc.

XXIII:38, "And the superscription was written over him, [in letters of Greek and Latin and Hebrew,] This is the King of the Jews."

XXIV:1, "they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices, which they had prepared, [and certain others with them.]"

John, iii:15, "that whosoever believeth in Him should [not perish, but] have eternal life."

V:16, "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, [and sought to slay him] because he had done these things on the Sabbath day."

VI:11, "And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks he distributed [to the disciples, and the disciples] to them that were set down."

VIII:59, "Then they took up stones to cast at him; but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, [going through the midst of them, and so passed by.]"

XI:41, "Then they took away the stone, [where the dead was laid.]"

XVI:16, "and again a little while and ye shall see me, [because I go to the Father.]"

XXI:25, "I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. [Amen.]"

This list of erasures contains a portion only of those that have been noted; but it is sufficiently formidable as it stands. Now the Church of God does not hold that the received Greek text is immaculate; it does not treat its inaccuracies as integral portions of divine revelation; nor will it be slow in correcting those inaccuracies when they are clearly shown to be such. But while comparative criticism is in its present immature condition, the Church will not countenance the Bible Union in taking such large liberties with the original Scriptures. It is to be borne in mind that the oldest copy extant of the New Testament, the Vatican, marked B, was made not earlier than

the fourth century. Until some light can be cast upon the history of the text during the first three or four centuries, until collations of the oldest MSS. are prepared, which can be every where relied on as accurate, until the critics can be agreed among themselves as to the vital points in the subject, and until these critics reach conclusions which they do not find themselves constrained to modify in their successive publications, the Church is not likely to brand, as spurious or suspicious, large and important portions of the Divine Word.

The case of the revisers is far from being clear when examined upon its merits. They omit, for example, the doxology of the Lord's prayer in Matt. vi: 13. The MS. copies marked A and C are defective at this chapter, and must be laid out of the question. The doxology is not found in B or D, but is found in nine of the unical MSS. It is contained also in the Syriac Peshito version, which was made in the *second* century, and is, therefore, about two hundred years older than the oldest of the MSS. Moreover, the Apostle Paul adopts the substance of the closing petitions and of the doxology in 1 Tim. iv: 18. We are aware of the line of argument followed by those who erase the passage; and of the insinuation, current among them, as to the value of the Peshito testimony; but we venture to predict that the church will not surrender the case as it now stands on the evidence.

From Luke, xi: 2, 4, the revisers exclude several clauses of the Lord's Prayer, to wit, the words: "which art in heaven;" "Thy will be done as in heaven so in earth;" "but deliver us from evil." Now the last of these petitions, at least, is contained in three out of four of the oldest copies, to wit: A, C, D and in fifteen other unical MSS. If this rule of excision were applied to the entire text of the Gospels how many fragments of it would remain to be gathered up?

Nor are the grounds tenable on which the Final Committee puts suspicion on the story of the woman taken in adultery (John, viii: 1-11). On examination it turns out that A is defective from John, vi: 50 to viii: 12; but the destructive critics say that the gap in the copy is not wide enough to include all the matter, therefore this particular passage must be ruled out! B omits it; C is defective from chap. vii: 3 to viii: 34; D contains the passage. Five other unical and two hundred cursive MSS. contain it. The Itala translation of the

second century, the apostolic constitutions of the end of the third, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome contain it. On the other hand many of the fathers, as Origen, Chrysostom, Tertullian and Cyprian do not quote it, or they exclude it; and the variations in the text are urged to the discredit of the passage. Is the church expected, on such narrow grounds as these, to expunge from the Gospel hitherto received one of the most instructive and touching incidents in the life of Christ? One thing at least is certain: if this narrative be an interpolation, its author had a wonderful insight, both speculative and spiritual, into the character of Jesus, and into the very heart of divine truth. We have aimed not at a full discussion of these questions, but at a brief statement of their leading features. The reader of these pages, with a critical apparatus before him, can easily determine for himself, the merits of the proposed alterations in the Greek text.

In turning from the revision of the original to that of the common English version, it is quite natural to inquire how the Final Committee have dealt with the passages which contain the word baptize and its correlatives. This will be shown by a few citations from their revised Gospels.

Matt. iii: 1, "In those days came John the Immerser, preaching in the wilderness of Judea."

III: 5, "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region about Jordan, and were immersed by him in the Jordan."

III: 13, 14, "Then Jesus comes from Galilee to the Jordan to John, to be immersed by him. But John sought to hinder him, saying: I have need to be immersed by thee, and dost thou come to me?"

III: 16, "And Jesus when he was immersed, went up straightway from the water," etc.

Mark, vii: 3, 4, "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they carefully wash their hands, do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders. And coming from the market, except they immerse themselves, they do not eat. And there are many other things which they have received to hold, immersions of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels and couches."

With a single exception, to be hereafter mentioned, the revisers adhere rigidly to this rendering. John the Baptist

every where appears with his new *alias*. Christ is made to say, "There has not risen a greater than John the Immerser." The disciples are equally scrupulous; for when Christ asked them: "Who do men say the Son of Man is? they said: some say John the Immerser." Even Herod and the daughter of Herodias, little as they loved John, cheerfully paid, as it seems, the tithe of mint in never forgetting his title. The damsel said, "Give me here, on a platter, the head of John the Immerser;" and Herod, when he heard of the fame of Jesus, said: "John the Immerser is risen from the dead." The Pharisees also, it would appear, were quite as tenacious as some of our excellent brethren now-a-days, respecting a certain ceremony; for "except they immerse themselves they do not eat," and they held among other traditions the "immersion of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels and couches." Now upon all this it may be safely affirmed: 1. There is no evidence, aside from these mis-translations, that the Pharisees always first immersed themselves before eating, or that they always purified their couches or beds by immersing them. 2. These renderings show the straits into which men are driven when they assume that words, appropriated to a religious use, must be taken always in one unchangeable signification. The word *αγγελος*, messenger, is applied in the New Testament to celestial spirits, and translated *angels*. Under their unbending rule the revisers should translate it *angel* in Luke, vii:34, "When the *messengers* of John were departed," etc. 3. The churches which worship God in the English tongue will hardly discard the common, and adopt the Baptist version, without taking some time for deliberation.

In a single instance the revisers depart from the rigid rule. They translate Mark, x:38, thus: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink, or to endure the immersion which I endure!" The word twice rendered *endure* here is the litigated *βαπτίζω*; and the same rendering is repeated twice in v. 39. The effect of this is to obscure what has been described as "the inimitable strength and beauty which is derived from the simple collocation (*wherewith I am baptized to be baptized*), and especially from the juxtaposition of these two forms of the same verb *βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι*" (Alexander). Still further it is a departure from the principle, laid down so peremptorily by the Bible

Union, as to the exactness with which the original "must be translated by corresponding words and phrases so far as they can be found." Has the Final Committee stumbled, for once, over the old stumbling block—*βαπτίζω*? \*

It is a very agreeable part of our present duty to turn from the course of adverse criticism to some of the good fruits of biblical scholarship which are exhibited in the new version. In many instances, the revisers have adopted into the text the marginal renderings of the common English bible, which are approved as judicious by the best modern scholars. The following are examples:

Matt. v: 21, "Ye have heard that it was said *by* them of old time." The margin reads *to* them.

VI: 1, "Take heed that ye do not your *alms* before men to be seen of them." The margin reads *righteousness*. With this amendment the verse lays down the general principle as to the manner of performing righteous deeds; and then the following verses to verse 18 apply the principle to three specific acts or manifestations of righteousness, to-wit, almsgiving, prayer, fasting. The original word, according to some of the oldest manuscripts and versions, is *δικαιοσύνη*. The revisers follow the margin.

X: 4. Simon, the disciple, is called "the Canaanite," as if he were either a descendant of the aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan, or a native of Cana, neither of which ideas is conveyed in the Greek. The margin reads: "Kananite, that is Zealot, as in Luke, vi: 15."

X: 16, "be ye therefore wise as serpents and *harmless* as doves." The word *simple* is suggested in the margin; meaning singleness and purity of motive.

---

\* We have seen but one revision of the Gospels published by the Union for European circulation. This describes John as "el Sumergidor;" Christ's baptism as "sumergido," and the purification of couches as "immersiones." But so far as we have examined, this version, issued in 1855, follows substantially the received Greek text, differing therein very widely (may we add fortunately?) from the revision in English, issued eight years later. Whether the Union will continue to circulate both versions, reconciled to their discrepancies in the text by their agreement in the immersions, or whether the society will suppress their former European editions and issue others, is a question upon which we have no information. We presume, though we do not know, that they are in a similar predicament with their favorite Bengalee and Burmese versions.

XXII: 20, "Whose is this image and superscription?" (marg. *inscription*?)

XXIII: 24, "Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." The impression, so generally prevailing among English readers, that "strain at" means "to swallow with difficulty" is incorrect. The Greek is well rendered in the margin "to strain out a gnat."

XXVIII: 19, "Go ye, therefore, and teach (marg., *disciple*) all nations."

Mark, vi: 27, "And immediately the king sent an *executioner* and commanded his head to be brought." The margin reads "one of his guard," the word *executioner* being an explanation rather than a literal translation of the word.

VII: 4, "as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of *tables*;" marg., *beds*:—*couches* would, perhaps, be better still.

The revisers might have adopted into the text some other marginal readings. Mark, x: 52, "Jesus said to the blind man, Go thy way, thy faith hath *made thee whole*;" hath *saved thee* both from bodily and spiritual blindness. XIII: 8, "These are the beginnings of *sorrows*." The margin has it *pains as of a woman in travail*. *Pangs* would perhaps express the idea. In both cases the revision follows the common version.

Among the new renderings, not suggested in the margin, which have been adopted by the revisers, the following may be taken as favorable instances:

Matt. i: 22, "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of (*υπο*) the Lord by (*δια*) the prophet," etc. According to modern usage the phrase would read "*by* the Lord," as the real author of the prophecy, "*through* the prophet," as the organ of communication. It is so rendered by the revisers.

II: 16, "Then Herod sent forth and slew *all the children* that were in Bethlehem." The masculine adjective and article used in the Greek, together with the true meaning of the noun, point to *male* children as the exact translation.

IX: 16, "No man putteth a piece of new (revisers say *unfulfilled*) cloth unto (*on*, rev.) an old garment."

XIII: 21, "when tribulation or persecution ariseth, because of the word by and by (rev., *immediately*), he is offended."

"By and by" is old English for *forthwith*, *instantly*; out procrastination, the inveterate vice of human nature, has infused the element of delay into the term "by and by," so that it is no longer an exact equivalent of the Greek *εὐθὺς*. The same remark applies to Mark, vi: 25, "And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying: I will that thou give me *by and by*, in a charger, the head of John the Baptist." The revisers say *immediately*; perhaps *forthwith*, or *without delay*, would be still better. So, also, in Luke, xxi: 9, for "the end is not *by and by*" read *immediately*. Comp. Luke, xvii: 7.

XIV: 8, "And the damsel being *before instructed* (rev., *urged on*) of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger." Perhaps *instigated*, as Alexander suggests, would be still better.

XX: 1. The term which is here rendered "householder," is in verse 11 of the common version rendered the "good man of the house." The revisers obliterate that unnecessary distinction.

XXII: 1-14. The parable of the marriage of the king's son. Trench, whom all biblical scholars are happy to recognize as the new Archbishop of Dublin, points out the distinction "between the *δουλοὶ* who summon the bidden guests (ver. 3, 4), and the *δρακονοὶ* who in the end expel the unworthy intruder (ver. 13). The first represent *men*, the ministers of Christ; the last are the *angels* who execute the divine judgments.—Luke, xix: 24. The revisers, following this suggestion, read "servants" in ver. 3, 4, and "attendants" in ver. 13.

XXVI: 41, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation." In Mark, xiv: 38, the same Greek words are translated in the common version, "watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation." The revisers amend the verbal discrepancy.

XXVIII: 14, "And if this *come to the governor's ears we* will persuade him and secure you." It is a favorite opinion with modern interpreters that the original text refers to the absence of Christ's body from the sepulchre as "coming before the governor," not incidentally, by way of mere rumor or news, but officially, as a matter of judicial inquiry. The revisers read it: "if this shall be heard before the governor;" using "heard," we suppose, in its legal sense.



Mark, i: 31, "immediately the fever left her, and she *ministered* unto them." Here the idea of a ministering, *continued for a time*, is expressed by the imperfect tense, showing the completeness of the miraculous cure.

Luke, i: 59, "They *called* (imperfect) him Zachariah," i. e. they *were calling* him Zachariah, when his mother interposed and called him John.

VI: 19, "because power *went out* (imperfect, i. e. *continually*) and healed them all."

VI: 23, "in the like manner *did* (imp., i. e. *habitually*) their fathers unto the prophets." Ver. 26, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you, for so *did* (*habitually*) their fathers unto the false prophets." The point given by this tense to the remark ought not to be lost.

So, also, by giving full effect to the imperfect tense, in Luke, viii: 41, Jairus *incessantly* "besought" Christ to heal his daughter; in viii: 52, the family of the dead maid *incessantly* "wept and bewailed" her; in xxiv: 27, Christ *continuously* "expounded" to the two disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself; in John, v: 16, 18, the Jews *constantly* persecuted Jesus, and *constantly* sought to slay him, because he *habitually* did these things on the Sabbath, and said that God was his father; in vii: 1, Christ would not walk in Judea, because the Jews *constantly* sought to slay him; in xi: 5, Jesus *habitually* loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus; in xiii: 22, when Jesus said one of you shall betray me, the disciples looked *continuously* on one another, doubting of whom he spake; in xxi: 18, Jesus said to Peter, when thou wast young, thou *habitually* girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldst. The most striking instance in point is Luke, xvii: 27, 28, where no less than ten imperfects may be found. These are treated as aorists in both the common version and the revision, whereas the true sense is that in the days of Noah they ate, drank, married and were given in marriage—all *habitually*; and, in the days of Lot, they ate, drank, bought, sold, planted and builded, all *habitually*. An instance, conveying a different shade of meaning, is in Luke, xiv: 7, Christ marked how the Pharisees *chose* out the chief rooms, as both our version and the revision translate the word; but according to the use of the imperfect, while they *were choosing* the chief rooms Christ spake the para-

ble. Now there would be, probably, a difference of opinion among competent scholars upon the question whether these adverbs, indicating incomplete, or continued, or habitual action, ought to be inserted in the text. Some might insist that these adverbs would be glosses, not translations; others, that the ideas they represent enter into the inmost sense of the imperfect tense, and must be expressed in an exact translation. But this is one of the questions which will come up for consideration when any final revision of the Greek scriptures is made. We do not perceive that the Committee is competent to settle that question authoritatively. By the way in which they have settled it for themselves, they fail to express, in a very large number of places, the precise sense of the Greek. In many of these cases, as in Luke, i: 59, and xiv: 7, the true meaning might have been rendered without the use of an adverb.

It is frequently alleged, as another short-coming of our version, that the obvious distinction between *εἶμι* to be and *γίνομαι* to become or to begin to be is almost habitually overlooked. Have the revisers corrected this inaccuracy? In many instances they have done so. As examples: in Matt. xvii: 2, "his garments became white as the light;" xxiii: 26, "that the outside of the platter may become clean;" xxiv: 32, "when the branch of the fig tree has already become tender." Luke, vi: 16, "Judas Iscariot, who became (i. e. afterwards) a traitor;" xi: 26, "the last state of that man became worse than the first;" ver. 30, "as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites;" xxii: 44, "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood;" John, ix: 27, "Will ye also become his disciples;" etc., etc. But, on the other hand, the places in which the distinction is obliterated are numerous. One of the most important of these, where the point, if not indeed the sense, of the passage depends on this discriminating use of the two verbs, is John, viii: 58, "Before Abraham began to be (*γενεσθαι*) I am (*εἶμι*)." The revisers have failed to mark the distinction not only here, but elsewhere; as, for examples: Matt. vi: 16, "when ye fast become not as the hypocrites of a sad countenance"—i. e. do not change the expression of the countenance; viii: 26, "and there began to be or there came on a great calm;" x: 16, "become therefore wise as serpents;" Mark, ix: 50, "if the salt lose its saltiness"—literally, if the salt become saltless (*αλας ἀναλον γίνηται*); Luke, x:

36, "which of these three *became* or *began* to be neighbor to him that fell among the thieves?" xv: 10, "there *begins* to be or *springs up* joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth;" John, vi: 17, "and it had now *become* dark;" x: 16, "there shall *come into being* one fold and one shepherd;" xx: 27, "and *become* not faithless, but believing;" *cum multis aliis.*

Trench, in his treatise on Bible Revision, has a fine chapter "on some unnecessary distinctions introduced" into our version, and another "on some real distinctions effaced." Some instances in which the revisers have made the proper discriminations have been adduced above; other cases have escaped their notice. The first miracle of the feeding of the multitude is recorded by the four evangelists, and in each instance the word *χορηνος* is used for the *baskets* in which the fragments were gathered.—Matt. xiv: 20; Mark, vi: 43; Luke, ix: 17; John, vi: 13. The second miracle of the same kind is recorded twice, and in both accounts *σπυρις* is used (Matt. xv: 37; Mark, viii: 8), pointing out the fact that there were two miracles of that description, and not one only, as some of the neologists pretend. The difference between the two terms may possibly be determined from the fact that Paul was "let down by the wall in a *σπυρις*" or *hamper*.—Acts, ix: 25. The revisers translate both terms by the word *basket*.—John, xxi: 15-17. The revisers mark the distinction between "Feed (*βοσκει*) my lambs" and "Feed (*ποιμανε*, *tend*, rev.) my sheep;" but they do not attempt to discriminate between the two verbs in verses 15-17. "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest (*αγαπας*) thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love (*φιλω*) thee." In verse 16, the same words are repeated. In verse 17, Christ responds to the tenderness of Peter by taking up his word. "He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest (*φιλεεις*) thou me." Simon replied, "thou knowest that I love (*φιλω*) thee." Trench, in his *Synonyms of the New Testament*, points out "the delicate and subtle play of feeling" exhibited in the use of these verbs.

Certain other words and phrases receive in the new revision a rendering which is not likely to obtain general acquiescence. A few examples out of many of this description may be quoted: Matt. v: 3-11. The revisers say, "*Happy* the poor in spirit;"

"*Happy* they that mourn;" "*Happy* the meek;" and so on through the catalogue, leaving us without the "seven beatitudes." The Greek adjective is twice applied to God in the New Testament: in 1 Tim. i:11, and vi:15, where it must be rendered *blessed*. The term should also undoubtedly take that meaning in Matthew, v, in order to convey the two ideas not contained in "happy:" to wit, that they who possess these graces share in the divine blessedness, and that their spiritual joy depends on the divine favor. They are blessed like God and they receive blessing from God.

V:18, "one jot and one tittle shall *not* pass from the law," etc. The particles *ou μὴ* make up an intense form of the negative, equivalent to by *no means* or by *no manner of means*. Compare Matt. xxvi:35, Luke, xxii:16, 18, 34. In these and many other cases the revision fails to give the full force of the expression.

VI:25, "Take no *thought* for your life what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink." Trench points out in one of his finest criticisms, the fact that the noun *thought* in the old English was an equivalent for solicitude and excessive anxiety; and he cites passages from Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Somers' Tracts, in which the persons are said to have died of *thought*. This scripture forbids not a prudent provision of necessary food and raiment for the future, but undue and unbelieving anxiety. The revisers leave the passage with the change of the adverb: "Take *not* thought."

IX:19, "And Jesus arose and followed him, and *so did* his disciples." The revisers omit "so did," leaving it doubtful whether these "disciples" belonged to the ruler or to Christ.

XI:17. The revisers have it: "We piped to you and you danced not; we sang the lament and ye beat not the breast."

Mark, i:1, "The beginning of the *Gospel* of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." The revisers translate it "good news." Nor is this all; for in every case in which the Greek word occurs in Mark (it is not found in the other Evangelists) it is rendered "good news" or "glad tidings," so that the good old word "*gospel*" is wholly expunged from the text. The word is allowed to stand in the titles thus: "The Gospel according to Matthew," etc., etc., but it would be rather difficult to show that the titles of the four books are part and parcel of the inspired text;

especially if the same rules of criticism be applied to them which have made, in the hands of the revisers, such havoc with the Lord's Prayer. It is but fair however to state, that in a preliminary note to the Acts and the first three Epistles, it is stated that, "in this volume, the term *gospel* has been retained, wherever the Greek word is understood to be used in its later and technical sense to which the word *gospel* now corresponds in English usage." What this "later and technical sense" is supposed to be, should have been but is not explained. But if it be the sense in which the word corresponds to a narrative of the life and teachings of Christ, there is reason to hope that the Final Committee will follow what appears to be a happy after thought, and restore the sacred term to its place in Mark, i:1, and under a liberal construction of the rule, in a few other places. It is, surely, an untoward result of biblical learning to deprive the Sermon on the Mount of the beatitudes, the Lord's Prayer of the doxology, and the Evangelists of the gospel—even in terms.

VIII:24. The revision reads: "And looking up he said: I behold men; for I see them as trees walking." The Greek text imperatively requires "walking" to be construed with "men." The meaning is: "I see them walking about in dim and confused outline—as much like trees as men." The revisers, however, have not removed the equivocal.

Luke, xvi:8, "And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done *wisely*." So the common version and the revisers. But many critics construe *φρονιμως* *prudently* or *shrewdly*—indicating worldly wisdom, in distinction from *σοφος* true wisdom.

Luke, xxii:36. The revisers translate thus: "he that has a purse let him take it, and likewise a bag; and he that has *none* let him sell his garment and buy a sword." *None* what? Purse? bag? or sword? The common version is better: "he that hath no sword let him," etc.

John, xiii:23. "And supper being ended, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him; *Jesus* knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God, he riseth from supper," etc. The revisers expunge the word

*Jesus* leaving the verbs *knowing*, *riseth*, etc., liable to an equivocal construction, either with the devil or with Christ.

The last topic to be considered is the English in which the revision appears. Its authors have, very wisely, made the authorized version the basis of the present work. According to the statement on the title page, it is "the common English version corrected." Among the corrections is the reduction of proper names to their modern forms; for examples: Jeremy and Jeremias are uniformly written Jeremiah; for Esaias they write Isaiah; for Elias, Elijah; for Jonas, Jonah; for Jewry, Judea. Certain forms of expression in our version, which are contrary to the present usage of the language, are also changed. *Whom* is altered to *who* in the expression, "Whom do men say that I am?"—Matt. xvi: 13; Mark, viii: 27, 29; Luke, ix: 18, 20. The relative *who* is substituted for *which* where persons are the antecedents: Matt. vi: 9, "Our Father *which* (*who*, rev.) art in heaven." Luke, ii: 11, "For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, *which* (*who*, rev.) is Christ the Lord." Compare Matt. v: 44; vi: 4. It is a curious fact that at the time our version was prepared the possessive pronoun *its* was very rarely used. It never occurs in the English New Testament. The pronouns *his* and *her* were used as neuters. We read in Matt. v: 13, "if the salt have lost *his* savor;" in Mark, ix: 50, "if the salt have lost *his* saltiness," etc., etc. There are distinct traces of this usage even in the most modern English; we apply *his* and *him* to the sun, *she* and *her* to the moon, to ships, and to certain famous cities, as Rome and Jerusalem. But the revisers generally employ *its* in such constructions. The common version, moreover, occasionally unites two moods in a single construction; as "if any man *be* a worshipper of God and *doeth* his will him he heareth." Solecisms of this kind are corrected in the revision. Luke, xxiv: 26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things," etc., conveys the idea that it was Christ's duty to suffer death. But *ought* here is an old English past tense of the verb to *owe*, and carries with it the notion of necessity. The revisers read: "*Was it not necessary*, that the Christ should suffer these things?" The Greek verb is *εδει*.

There are, however, many points, some of them minute and others more important, which will be debated with the revisers. It will be doubted, for example, whether they have been alto-

gether successful in their treatment of the antiquated forms of speech, contained in the common version. They have neither wholly eliminated this element, nor have they left it untouched; but have, apparently, attempted a compromise between the old and the new, which, like most compromises, is not self-consistent. They sometimes discard the termination of the third person singular, *eth*; sometimes they retain it. These instances occur: Matt. iii:13, "Then *comes* Jesus from Galilee;" viii:9, "to another come and he *cometh*;" v:28, "looks;" ver. 29, "causes;" ver. 32, "commits;" ver. 42, "asketh." In many cases both forms appear in a single construction: Luke, vi:47, "Whosoever *comes* to me and *hears* my sayings and *doeth* them;" ver. 49, "But he that *hears* and *doeth* not," etc.

The revisers show the same inconsistency in their treatment of the word *offend* and its cognates. These terms have lost one of the leading significations which belong to them in the old English. To offend was used as an equivalent of the verb to stumble or to be made to stumble; hence, in a secondary meaning, it signified to lay a snare, to put stumbling blocks in the way of others, or to betray them into sin. Matt. v:29, "If thy right eye *offend* (*σκανδαλίζῃ*) thee, pluck it out;" i. e. if the eye incurably betray thee into sin. Mark, ix:42, "Whosoever shall *offend* one of these little ones that believe in me," etc.; i. e. cause them to stumble, or to fall into grievous sins. Matt. xxvi:31, "All ye shall be *offended* because of me this night;" i. e. ye shall be betrayed into sin. Now, in the first of these passages, the revisers read "if thy right eye causes thee to offend;" in the second, "whosoever shall cause one of these little ones to offend;" but, in the third they retain the word *offended*, either by inadvertence, or perhaps because they judged the sense of the passage to be expressed by the use of the word as equivalent to *displease*. In either case they have missed the true meaning of the expression. Surely Christ did not intend to say that his disciples could be *displeased* or *provoked* with him when he should be arrested in the garden. The revisers should have allowed the word to stand, in every case, on its old English signification, or they should have modified it wherever necessary to the sense. Partial changes from the old to the new perplex the reader.

Nor are they uniformly successful in their construction of the historical present. The peculiar vividness of the conceptions



formed by the Greek mind, allowed the Greeks not only to use, very freely, the present for the past, but to exchange one tense for another, and that repeatedly, in the same sentence. Our language lays great restraint on this versatility of conception and expression; and the common version adheres to the English idioms. But the revisers have, not unfrequently, incorporated the Greek idiom into the English text, throwing the construction into awkward forms: John, xiii: 3, "knowing that the Father *had given* all things into his hands and that he *came* out from God and *is going* to God, he *risés* from supper and *lays* aside his garments, and taking a towel *girded* himself. After that he *pours* water into the basin and *began* to wash the feet of his disciples," etc. In the course of seven verses (verses 3-10) there are eight changes between the present and the past in the verbs. XIX: 9, "And he *went* again into the palace and *says* to Jesus, Whence art thou. But Jesus *gave* him no answer. Then *says* Pilate to him," etc. The effect of this rigid adherence to the forms of the Greek grammar is to produce, not a translation, but a transfer of Greek idioms into an English dress. Why not, on that principle, allow the transfer of a Greek word like *baptize*? In another passage the revisers follow the common version in the transfer of a Hebraistic phrase: "children (*sons*, rev.) of the bride chamber," for the *attendants of the bridegroom*, or the *groomsmen*. Well enough this in the old version, which allows the transferring of words and phrases, but not so well in one that is, in itself, a protest against the practice.

The change of expression is not fortunate in Luke, xxiii: 6, "When Pilate heard of Galilee he asked whether the man were a Galilean." This good old English is "corrected" thus: "he asked if the man is a Galilean."

It is agreed among the best interpreters that it would have been well if our translators had taken a distinction between *γεεννα*, the place of eternal punishment, and *αδης* the abode of the dead. It is particularly necessary to mark this distinction in Acts, ii: 27, 31, where the soul of Christ is said to have been in *αδης*, or *hell* according to our version. The revisers propose the word "underworld" as the equivalent of *αδης*. Matt. xi: 23, "Thou Capernaum which art exalted to heaven shalt be thrust down to the underworld." The word is an ungraceful coinage, and most persons would prefer to naturalize the Greek *hades*; pleading

the example of the revisers in their readiness to adopt both Greek and Hebrew idioms.

Biblical scholars have called attention to the fact, that in the authorized version, a single English word represents many different words in the Greek. Thus, twenty-one Greek words are translated *depart* in our New Testament, twenty Greek words answer to *show*, fifteen to *bring forth*, fourteen to *declare*, fourteen to *give* and eighteen to *receive*. On the other hand, a single Greek word is treated as an equivalent to many English words. Thus *λογος* is translated into twenty-eight different expressions in our New Testament, *παρεστημι* represents sixteen, and *ποιεω* fifty-one. It is not possible in the nature of the two languages, on the one hand to efface, on the other to represent, all these distinctions, yet it can hardly be doubted that the *copia verborum* of both vocabularies could be handled, by perfect masters, with far greater skill. We do not perceive that the revisers have made much progress in this direction.

Our limits do not allow this examination to be extended, although the materials in our hands are not exhausted. But the alterations which the Bible Union has made, in both the Greek and the English text of the authorized version, have been sufficiently indicated, to bear us out in submitting certain conclusions to the judgment of the Christian public.

In the first place, this revision considered, not as a substitute for the common version, but simply as a contribution to biblical literature, is of considerable value. It exhibits the findings of protracted study and excellent scholarship directed to the formation of an authentic Greek text, and to the adequate expression of its meaning in the vernacular. A new translation, as an addendum to a volume of notes, is always acceptable; and if the revisers had sent forth their version in connection with such a commentary as the admirable work of Dr. Hackett on the Acts of the Apostles, they would have performed an important service. But the naked revision, although it presents the last results of their labors and will be useful to the student, is not likely to be estimated at its intrinsic worth; and we are left to lament that so much scholarly ability has been, in a great measure, sunken, in what we must be allowed to consider, an unprofitable enterprise.

In the second place, this revision is not likely to supersede the common version. The old-fashioned Bible is too firmly rooted in the traditions and affections, natural and supernatural, of the English-speaking races to be easily supplanted by any revision whatever. No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, the old is better. But apart from this consideration, which may be set down to the score of habit or to the score of prejudice, there are rational grounds for this opinion. It may be confidently presumed that the Church at large will not, in the present state of biblical science, accept of this as the final settlement of the Greek text. A certain number of the various readings, adopted by the revisers, may be sustainable on critical grounds, with the all but unanimous consent of the masters in the science; but who shall persuade the Christian public to accept of new readings, in respect to which the arguments are nearly balanced, and the authorities are nearly equally divided, some of these authorities meanwhile wavering in their judgments? Many of the proposed amendments do not materially affect the sense of Scripture and may be received. But will the people of God allow, without debate, the Lord's Prayer in Matthew to be bereft of the doxology; the Lord's Prayer in Luke to be expunged in two of its leading petitions; and the story of the adulteress and the Pharisees in John, viii, to be *girdled* with brackets and left to its fate? The changes made in the English text, taken as a whole, furnish other grounds of this judgment. Some of these changes, suggested long ago in the margin, or established in the consent of the best interpreters, will be thought to convey the exact sense of the original. But the revisers adopt some corrections the value of which has not been determined, and others which are generally rejected by the best interpreters; they fail to remove certain ambiguities; they create new ambiguities; they transfer Greek idioms into the English text; admit awkward constructions; are not infallible in the moods and tenses; in short they are not, any more than King James' translators, guiltless of mistakes. All these might be over-looked in a commentary, but they are fatal to a version which proposes to supplant the old-fashioned Bible. In using a commentary, too, we might be disposed to reconsider the proper meaning of *βαπτίζω*; but here it is proposed to settle, forever, the mode of bap-

tism against the convictions of nine-tenths of Christendom. This is the proposed settlement: first, the Bible Union prepares a corrected version of the English New Testament; next it introduces the words immerse, immersion, and immerser; lastly it proposes that the nine-tenths of Christendom shall adopt the new version as infallible therein; a short and easy method that of determining controversies!

The patronage under which the revision is published, although very respectable, will not be able, in the face of these obstacles, to command success. The American Bible Union is a voluntary society in the city of New York. Neither proficiency in biblical learning nor even a profession of religion is required as a qualification for membership; but "thirty dollars makes a life member and one hundred dollars a life director." It is understood, that the members of the society are, almost exclusively, of the Baptist persuasion, including the churches of the "Reformation," in which the Rev. Alexander Campbell is a distinguished teacher. Some of the most eminent men, among the Baptists, have, however, from the beginning, discountenanced the proceeding; and in the end it will appear that wisdom is justified of all her children. In the stout array of the officers of the Union, seventy-two in number, may be found some honored brethren, but we look in vain for the persons of such men as Wayland, Williams, Hague, and Sears. The ancestral images of twenty illustrious houses were borne aloft in a famous procession at Rome; "but" adds Tacitus, "Cassius and Brutus outshone all the others from the fact that their statues were not seen."

The ultimate personal authority on which this revision rests is in a position of yet more deplorable weakness. Who are, in the last instance, responsible for the work? The only information, as yet made public, is contained in the title page: "The common English version corrected by the Final Committee of the American Bible Union." The remarkable fact is, that the names of this committee have been effectually, if not studiously, concealed. Neither the published list of officers, among whom are found the names of forty-one vice presidents, and twenty-seven managers, nor the constitution, nor the proceedings of the society, nor the public journals, afford a single hint as to the persons who have undertaken to determine, finally, for the English-speaking races, the true Hebrew and Greek text of the

Holy Scriptures, and the true rendering of that text into the English tongue. It is hardly to be supposed that the revision is intended for the use of the Baptists alone; since the practical effect of the measure, in that case, would be to separate the denomination, more widely than before, from the other branches of the church. The common impression has been, and is, that this revision is intended to supersede the authorized version. If this be true, who are the people that are expected to acquiesce in this project? They are all the powerful Protestant churches in this country, speaking first through their great ecclesiastical courts, and then through the thousands of their ministers and communicants; they are the established churches of the three kingdoms of Great Britain, represented by sovereign, parliament, convocation, general assemblies, archbishops, bishops, ministers, universities; they are the dissenting churches of the empire, scarcely less powerful, speaking through their appropriate organs. Are these immense tribes and nations of God's people expected to abandon the old English Bible and accept in place thereof a version made under the auspices of a portion only of a single denomination; prepared, moreover, not to protect any fundamental doctrine of faith, but in the interest of what the great mass of Christians believe to be a delusion respecting the mode of baptism? And, still further, are they expected to adopt a version, which not only sets aside their baptism, but handles, with immoderate freedom, both the Greek and the English texts; and all this on the authority of an anonymous committee? If these be the plans and expectations of the Union, did any enterprise ever undertaken by Christian men carry with it the certainty of a more signal failure?

A critical examination of this revision will show, thirdly, that there is no urgent necessity for any change in the authorized version. We do not deny that there are inaccuracies in the English version, as it now stands; nor do we prefer an inexact translation to a perfect one; nor do we doubt that the progress of biblical learning has thrown much light upon the true text and the true meaning of Scripture. But this revision does, in effect, unite its testimony with that of the entire body of the learned, in behalf of the substantial accuracy and sufficiency of the common version. The numerous changes proposed by the revisers in the Greek text, with a few exceptions, do not go to

the inmost sense of the record, and these exceptions apply to readings which can not, in the present state of criticism, be established. The changes proposed in the English text, even if they were all accepted, would not add, in any appreciable degree, to the perspicuity or spiritual efficacy of the Divine Word. Besides this, every real improvement in the translation can be, and is in fact even now, made known through the margin, or through popular commentaries used in Sunday schools and bible classes, or through the pulpit. If competent scholars will continue to prepare expositions exhibiting the ripest fruits of their labors; if the ministers of the Gospel will faithfully study the inspired originals, with such helps as are offered them; if by expository preaching, and by instructing bible classes they will make known the true meaning of the word, they will communicate to the people exact knowledge—exact according to their light—of the mind of the Spirit.

The labors of these revisers point, fourthly, to a very satisfactory conclusion as to the purity of the Greek text of the New Testament. The efforts of great scholars have been directed for three hundred years to the formation of a critical text. Many hundred manuscripts and versions have been collated, and many thousand various readings have been discovered. Yet these readings go only, for the most part, to the omission, repetition or transposition of single letters or syllables, to the use of synonyms, or to particles without appreciable force; and hundreds of them are, without doubt, to be referred to the ignorance and carelessness of the copyists. None of them assails a single doctrine of our common salvation; they leave untouched nearly every passage and word in which such doctrine is delivered.

The texts formed by the most learned critics, the Sinai manuscript lately discovered by Tischendorf, the text adopted by these revisers, and even that made up by Alford, who is almost a "destructive," will confirm any candid mind in the substantial integrity of the Greek Testament in common use, as an exhibition of the very words in which the Holy Spirit caused the book to be composed. All the various readings, taken together, affect the real sense of Scripture as little as the clouds of dust and leaves swept from the Sierra Nevada by a summer wind, or a few stones loosened from its surface by a summer rain, mar the



stability and configuration of the range of mountains, or spoil the treasures of virgin gold hidden within.

All these premises terminate in this as their final conclusion: the problem of a revision of the English Scriptures can not be resolved by the present generation. It has been proposed in various forms; in the attempt of the American Bible Society to establish an amended standard of the authorized version, in the publications of Trench, and of the "Five Clergymen" in London, in the New Testament edited by the Rev. Alexander Campbell, and now in the labors of the Bible Union. These movements have invariably demonstrated that the world is not ripe for so great and difficult an enterprise. In the meantime, a proposition in the Presbyterian General Assembly, for the preparation of a church commentary appears to have taken a similar direction. Neither of these ideas can be realized at present; perhaps not even in the ages to come. But let us hope that Biblical learning may, at least, attain to both of these results, as its grand consummation. The Hebrew text is well nigh settled. The ancient Greek text will be slowly evolved through the progress of comparative criticism; the Hebrew tongue, with its cognates, will be well considered; the classical Greek and Hellenistic Greek, in its etymology and syntax, in the elaborate structure of its verb, the subtle forces of its particles, and the inimitable flexibility and complication of its sentence-forms, will be progressively unfolded; biblical chronology, archæology, geography and natural science, will be investigated anew, and again anew. The product of all these toils never ceasing, never weary, may gladden the hearts of God's people in the form of a commentary on his Word, which shall embody the judgments of Christian scholars counted by thousands—as the sea gathers into its bosom and assimilates all the waters. To this must be added an adequate acquaintance with the English language, in all its sources and elements and philosophy, together with what Cicero calls the *delectus verborum*, the perfected vocabulary, which expresses exact thought in exact terms—demanding a culture won by the prolonged study of the best models, and by the deepest insight into the genius, both of the language and of the civilization of which that is the finest product. Given such an authentic text as is here indicated, such knowledge of the ancient languages, such exquisite skill in the use of the vernacular,



together with the commentary, and the vast learning employed in its composition, and the conditions of a revision of the English Scriptures will require only a general agreement of the people of God to become complete. Other tongues, spoken by man, will also demand that the treasures of the Word be conveyed to their keeping; in each instance with the same fidelity as to the substance and the same consummate skill in the diction. Our Baptist brethren will, on mature reflection, we doubt not, take this comprehensive view of both the possibilities and difficulties of the case; and they will be satisfied if their revision, although it be not received as "final," shall be allowed to hold a place among the materials which shall enter into the composition of the best possible commentary, and, of what is the consummate result of such a commentary, an exact translation of the Scriptures into all spoken languages.

---

ART. IV.—*The Loyalty demanded by the present Crisis.*

It is proposed in this paper to consider the sentiments which a truly loyal man should entertain toward those who are now called of God to exercise authority over the nation. This will involve a review of the difficulties which beset the Administration at its beginning, and the necessities growing out of the war which the rebellion has forced upon our people. And, as no administration has ever before had to grapple with such tremendous opposition, or try so many hitherto untrodden paths of action, none have deserved so much lenity from loyal men for mistakes in judgment, or measures of questionable legality.

It will be pertinent to the subject to dissect the character of those pretended patriots who, while proclaiming at the street corners and along the highways, that they are just as good Union men as anybody, yet, by their every act and word show their animus to be treasonable and their influence with the enemies of our country. And, as there are connected with these, in effect if not in purpose, numerous croakers and birds of ill omen, who despair of the Republic, and magnify temporary advantages gained by the secessionists; who villify every measure

of the Government which was not enacted for their own special behoof; who predict the utter subversion of the Constitution when its enemies are punished; it is proposed to show that the efforts of such persons have a direct tendency to weaken the hands of Union men and strengthen the enemy; and, therefore at this time, however allowable a certain licentiousness of speech may be in peace, are positively disloyal and wicked.

The foundation of all stable government is the sanction and blessing of God granted to rulers. For by Him kings reign and princes decree justice: and, therefore, as the established powers are ordained of God, those who on insufficient grounds resist this ordinance, receive to themselves condemnation and misery; as the leaders of the present unholy insurrection are learning to their confusion. It is very true that a government may become oppressive by subverting the liberties which it was established to protect; that a magistrate may lead the people astray by first forsaking God, as did Saul; and thus both constitution and executive become a burden so heavy that the voice of the people as a voice from heaven cries out against the oppression, and the yoke is justly shaken off. But in order to justify such action the perversion must be unquestionable, and the tyranny intolerable. The senseless murmurs of a restless and ambitious faction, or the disappointed hopes of shelved politicians, are not to be regarded. For these are usually nothing but the evidence that their occupation of making silver shrines for themselves, is gone, and their uproarious cries are only the expression of selfishness, but do not in the least atone for the crime of rebellion or compensate for the miseries of a popular uprising. For governments, however well administered by fallible human agents, and over such creatures, can only be a system of compensations, effected by the surrender of individual preferences for the common good; and hence it follows, from the nature of the case, that instances must occur wherein grievances are felt and occasions made for selfish complaining. And while such complaining is counter to the spirit and needs of civil society, it is also unreasonable because subversive of the common good, and contrary to the divine ordinance, which requires submission. Nor should the loyalty of the subject be expressed by a formal submission to authority, an outward obedience as if extorted by fear; but a hearty support, a cordial acquiescence in those mea-

asures which the public welfare demands through personal sacrifice. This is not all, the true patriot honors the ruler as such, though differing from him in political views, because he is the visible representation of the divine power in the state. Even when the character of the magistrate be such that a good man can not approve of it, still, while the person can not be respected the office must be honored and obeyed. This is without doubt the true notion of loyalty—a sentiment far too little regarded in our country since partizan rancor ran so high near the close of Washington's presidential term, and, from the absence of which, our rulers have been deprived of that moral support which is imperatively necessary to the successful working of governments when the purposes of the executive are thoroughly honest. As a people, we have been nearly destitute of that romantic devotion to the persons of our magistrates which has so often been manifested in other countries; and, while it is the highest earthly reward, is one of the firmest securities that the confidence bestowed will not be betrayed. It by no means follows, that we must approve of everything which the constituted powers can do in order to be loyal citizens. The divine right of kings to tyrannize was a doctrine never palatable on this side of the Atlantic, and is becoming less so generally on the other. Our danger has been in the opposite extreme, and our course in this respect has been to drive the better class of men from our political arena, and take as a *dernier resort* those second or third rate politicians, who, but too well satisfied to feed at the public expense, did not shrink from the abuse and dishonor cast by the opposite faction; but which are so abhorrent to a pure-minded conscientious man. It is our privilege to learn wisdom from the results of our own errors; and it is sincerely to be hoped that henceforth we will avoid that mistaken policy to which we, in common with all democracies, are prone.

A hearty loyalty on the part of the people toward their rulers being a Christian virtue, as well as a necessary accompaniment of all stable government, it follows that this is the more indispensable when the existence of the state is threatened. For though in a time of profound quiet, when no unusual expedients must be resorted to in order to maintain the supremacy of the government, it may be admissible, even necessary, to scruti-

nize closely the conduct of rulers, and call them to strict account for doubtful measures, so that their improper actions may be corrected; yet when their overthrow is threatened by unlawful opposition, we should not, unless usurpation be unmistakably their object, withdraw our moral support. For it then becomes our highest earthly duty to rally without delay to their aid, and strike down the foe who endeavors to destroy our liberty in the person of our lawfully constituted ruler. And here let a common and fatal error be noted. Many hold that they can support the Government of the United States without supporting the Administration; that they can be loyal to the Constitution, while acknowledging no allegiance to those who have been elected in precise conformity with its provisions. That is, a man can be loyal to the Constitution while utterly disregarding its most important provisions: can be obedient or disobedient according to his interest or inclination; can be at liberty to yield obedience when his favorite party is in power, and can wholly set at nought every obligation when his candidate is defeated. Such is the deplorable disloyalty manifested by many who claim to be Union men. Such is the sentiment of the peace party at the North, and the multitudes in the border states who have taken the oath of allegiance to obtain Federal protection. But this is nothing but disunion manifested by those who are too cowardly to fight for a principle; and is just as hurtful, and infinitely more contemptible, than that open rebellion which the enemy in arms manifests. A grain of common sense shows that we can not separate between our rulers and the state, saying that we owe all allegiance to the latter and none to the former. Until any officer has been superseded by his rightful successor he is our magistrate, and the visible representative of the only power on earth to which we owe allegiance, and whether we approve all his acts or not, we must obey unless his commands manifestly contravene the law of God—and it is at our peril if we disobey.

Now, if these things be true at all, that loyalty is a virtue, but resistance to lawfully constituted authority a crime of most aggravated character, then *a fortiori* at such a crisis as the present, it behooves us to unite in the cordial support of those whom God has placed over us, even though they, in their efforts to subdue our common enemies, may have encroached on some

of our cherished rights; for, as before said, government is a system of compensations by which conflicting interests are united when all is at peace; of course, it follows that in war each man must surrender more of his private interests, and sink his own individuality far more in the common good. There is no sacrifice which the state may not justly call him to make; and the same holds good of particular parts of country and bodies of people constituting the whole. These doctrines are irrefragably true if any system of government be maintained, and no opposition would be offered to them if they were promulgated in the abstract; but the special application of them to our own case is fraught with difficulties, because the conflicting interests of the few shut out from view the common good of the whole. To this, the greatest evil by far which now besets our political pathway, special attention is directed.

At the commencement of the present insurrection, the Government of the United States was called to legislate for a people of various political views, influenced by strongly conflicting interests, and holding to hostile institutions. Added to this, the party previously in power had been the vacillating but ever dishonest tool of those who had long been the advocates of secession; and in their interest had perverted the whole power of the nation, as well as wasted the resources of the people. There was a powerful faction arrayed against the incoming administration, which, having prejudged and determined to destroy it, was prepared by all kinds of misrepresentation to influence the minds of the lukewarm by appealing to sectional prejudices and the jealousies arising from slavery; so that, do or say what the Executive might, nothing could avail to allay suspicions, and satisfy the minds of traitors that the interests of the nation would be safe in his hands. To meet the expectations of honest men who differed on important issues was difficult; to satisfy those determined to oppose, was impossible. All that could be done was to pursue an honest but determined policy; one insuring not the gratification of a fractional minority of malcontents, nor the tame submission to the demands of an unpatriotic neutrality, nor yet the perfect affiliation with the extreme men who had aided in carrying the election, but a conservative course indicated by the wishes of every true patriot. Such, there can be no doubt, was the pur-

pose of the President; such, at least, the avowed intention of one who, by the course he has pursued, has extorted from many who admired him least the admission that he is honest and patriotic. Who now, at this stage of our national troubles, doubts for a moment that had the secessionists laid down their arms and quietly submitted to lawful authority, all the guaranteed rights of the states would have remained intact, and Mr. Lincoln would have administered the government with fidelity, exhibiting a due regard to the interests of the whole people? But when the malcontents raised the standard of revolt; when the plot was laid to assassinate the legitimate choice of the people, seize the capital with the archives of the nation, and on the ruins of lawfully constituted authority erect the creature of mob violence, and thus utterly destroy our free institutions; then nothing remained but for the President to defend the Government, as well as his own rights, by summoning to his aid all the forces which the Constitution and the common sense of self-preservation put at his disposal. As the head of the nation he could do no less, except he were the veriest poltroon in the land; yet for this he has been censured without stint by a venal press in our midst, and, as was to be expected, by the enemies of freedom abroad. Traitors in the North have vied with their friends in the South in reviling the President for that which the first law of nature dictates.

But it is deserving our closest attention that when the President called for help, he did not first turn to the radicals of his party, but to the conservatives of the whole country; and the policy which he tenaciously held was not that of extreme men; so that those of moderate views had it in their power, by rallying to his help, to have had the war conducted on those principles which they advocate, and which Mr. Lincoln had constantly manifested. However, in default of this support, which we in the border states, as well as the conservative men throughout the country, denied him, he was forced further to the extreme of his party than he evidently desired to go; for every public man, and especially in a crisis, must have the support of a powerful and well-agreed constituency; no lukewarm and vacillating helpers, but those who will give themselves and all they possess for the cause they maintain. The supporters of Mr. Lincoln have therefore been almost exclu-



sively those who affiliated with the Republican party; who, while most of them did not desire that slavery, though doubtless the real cause of the war, should be made the turning-point of its continuance, could nevertheless feel no desire to fight for its perpetuity. Nor was this feeling strange. For it must be borne in mind that the great majority of our people from the days of our independence, in common with most Christian nations, looked upon the institution as a moral, social, and economical evil; and while it had a recognized status by the law of the land, this was effected at the time we became a separate nation, through fear that the agitation of the subject might prevent the cordial union of all the states. But our people have always looked forward to the time when this stigma on our free institutions could, by all lawful and proper means, be destroyed. For it is perfectly clear from their words and acts, that the political fathers of our country, even those in the South—such as Washington, Jefferson and Henry—were wont to speak in such terms of the institution as would, in the days when chivalry was in full bloom, have branded their authors with the name of abolitionist, and caused a sudden appreciation in the price of pitch and feathers.

Nor can we blink the fact that most of our political troubles, from the day we became a nation, have arisen from the relations of slavery to the government; so that it is not the least strange that those who were careless as to its continuance, provided it did not carry its disturbing influence beyond its sectional boundaries, should look with an evil eye upon its existence, now that it is exhibited prominently as the destroyer of our peace. Doubtless wrong has often been intended by the abolitionists, and such wrongs as were keenly felt by us in the border states. While this was extremely distasteful to us as an interference with our vested rights, the most we could say was, that this was generally the result of individual madness and folly, as the deplorable John Brown raid; or, at most, the agitation of newspapers to make electioneering capital, and the unfriendly legislation of individual states. For the General Government has always, before this outbreak, been jealous of our rights, has invariably shown an accommodating spirit toward our wishes, not to say a truckling obsequiousness to our constantly increasing demands and arrogance. The Supreme



Court had in fact become so completely subsidized to the interests of slavery, since the death of Chief Justice Marshall, that we could get any decision we desired. We could carry slavery into all the territories (the only real plea for secession ever offered), at the very time the war begun; so that, so far as the Government was concerned, we had nothing of which we could complain. It is true, we could not compel our brethren in the North to love and cherish the peculiar institution; we could not make all our own people, either the laboring classes or the more intelligent, believe precisely as our political leaders would have us in the divinity of the system. We can not reasonably expect, therefore, that a system, which from the first depended on sufferance for its existence, and which had been the source of so much political acrimony, when it had, in the estimation of the majority of our people, continued its encroachments until it produced insurrection, could be otherwise than hated by those who came from the free states to fight our battles. As reasonable men, therefore, we must bear these facts in mind when we account for the course which the Government has been compelled to take since it was assailed, and had to call the people to its relief. If it be replied that the assumption of slavery being the cause of the war is a false one, this avails nothing against the argument. For a deep-seated conviction, whether true or false, is equally strong in influencing human conduct; and when a belief is universal we must take it into account in all matters which it influences, even though we can prove its falsity.

We must likewise remember when a nation becomes implicated in colossal difficulties, it is closely scrutinized by its neighbors. Hence, while free from trouble it might pursue its course regardless of friend or enemy, without much danger, yet when on trial for existence it must pay some deference to the moral convictions of civilized nations. For if all things do not move on in harmony with the sense of justice obtaining among neighboring governments, other powers may interfere in the internal policy of the one jeopardized by civil strife. As no man can live entirely by himself, so neither can a community or nation. Nothing was more dreaded by our people at the commencement of the civil war than foreign interference, and such fear was not without reason. For those European states with

which we had most intercourse, having abolished African slavery in their own dominions, had been officious in their zeal that we should follow their example, and showed an unmistakable hostility to us for refusing. This was often far more the result of hostility to us, than of moral sentiment or desire for the welfare of the parties concerned; so that when our domestic troubles seemed fair to make us an easy prey to their power, there was every reason to apprehend trouble from this source. Now, if we take the tone of the foreign press and statesmen which are truly friendly to us as a criterion, we may safely hazard the assertion that Mr. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, however distasteful it be to loyal slaveholders, has done more to gain favor for us among foreigners, and ward off from us the intervention of England and France, than all other political measures together. For the sentiments of those nations are determinedly hostile to slavery; and however unfriendly those powers themselves are to us, yet the sympathy of the common people with the emancipation movement, has rendered it impossible for the governments to take part with those who, in the words of Alexander Stephens, make slavery the corner stone of their political fabric.

These considerations have doubtless had their weight with the President in shaping his emancipation policy, and the wonder is that all combined have not given a greater preponderance than they have. Nothing but the most unflinching integrity, combined with the tenderest regard for the rights of loyal men in the slave states, could have prevented more aggressive movements on the part of the Executive. For, however startling the measures advocated in several of Mr. Lincoln's proclamations appear to us, we are too prone to look at them as something which has occurred in time of peace, when there was no pressure brought to bear upon him by the necessities of the hour. We should contemplate them from a war stand point; as something which the military condition seemed at least to the Government to demand, in order, by every available means, and at the least sacrifice of life and treasure, to weaken the power of the enemy. We moreover forget that these measures were not intended to injure Union men, since provision is made for their indemnification when their property is taken; that traitors only are sought to be weakened; and in truth are the only ones perma-

nently affected. But in our zeal lest our rights be invaded, we assume as our own the wounds inflicted on the disloyal; forgetting the labors and dangers of our friends, while commiserating the punishment which traitors have brought upon themselves while essaying to compass our destruction. If our attention was more fixed on the great interests of our Government now jeopardized, and our sympathies brought into livelier action for the sufferings which this unholy rebellion has brought upon the defenders of freedom; if all would acquiesce more heartily in the punishments which befall secessionists, as the natural outworking of their own wicked schemes, and reserve our complaints against the President for invading our rights while this is merely prospective, it is clear that we would act more the part of patriots, and sooner witness the entire subversion of treason.

But to advance one step farther. Suppose our institutions have been trampled upon in some degree by the General Government, and we are actually in danger of losing part of the rights we once enjoyed. Admit that the people of the North are not willing to accord to us the immunities which the laws of our common country grant to slave property, still it does not follow that we alone suffer, or indeed more than our neighbors across the river, in any other sense than as being made the theater of hostilities. This is surely a great grievance, but arises solely from our geographical position added to our complication with the prime cause of the war. The status of the whole country must be changed by a contest of such magnitude, and it is idle for us to expect our condition to remain the same after this universal commotion. Immense amounts of wealth are always destroyed in war, which are so much capital taken from the industrial resources of the country, and the people must be impoverished to that extent. This may, it is true, be represented mostly by the Government debt; but however it be expressed, there is as much less property in the country as has been consumed by waging war; and this sum will make itself be felt in our future condition, in the form of increased taxation. From the greater amount of productive capital in the North, this must chiefly be met there. Accordingly, while all loyal people must feel the pecuniary burdens growing out of the war, we may expect to suffer with them.

But if we experience losses in our slave property, our case is not singular, for the Government takes away forcibly from all loyal citizens the means to support the war, which, so far as can be seen, would never have arisen except for the existence of that species of property we feel to be peculiarly endangered. And it should ever be remembered whence this danger has arisen. For if the South had been content with the guarantees which the forbearance of men in the convention of 1787 gave to the institution, and which subsequent legislation had continually strengthened, no occasion would have arisen requiring interference. We in Kentucky and other border states suffered far more than those farther south from hostility to slavery, yet we were satisfied with our condition; well knowing that our peculiar institution was unpopular with our northern neighbors, and with their sentiments toward it our slaves could not be wholly secure. But the Congress of the United States, as if to take away every ground of complaint, and calm every fear for the future, passed, by an overwhelming majority, a resolution effectually guaranteeing perpetual immunity from interference on the part of the General Government; so that there was in this respect again, no excuse nor specious pretext for the secession movement. So we see that it is secession which has brought all the danger upon us; and if we complain let us bestow our grumbling on the proper party. But now that the war has been inaugurated by the traitors, it brings incalculable evils on all parts of our country; so that, in an economical point of view, the debt entailed upon us, even if the war be closed this year, will not fall short of two thousand million dollars; three-fourths of which will have to be paid by those who were opposed to slavery and derived no direct advantage therefrom. This sum, to be paid by those who did not participate in the institution, is sufficient to buy every slave in the country, paying the enormous rate of five hundred dollars per caput. Why then, we repeat, should our people murmur so loudly if they do lose their slave property? It is, to say the most, no more valuable than any other kind. Or, if we must find vent to our sense of wrong, why not against those who forced the Government to engage in a war the effect of which, with any method of conducting it, must be to endanger the status of slave property, as all civil wars have a tendency to do. We should, then, if the

alternative comes, as good patriots submit to those measures which our Executive has tried earnestly and perseveringly to avoid, but which the sentiments of the great body of the loyal people, or the exigencies of the times, may force him reluctantly to take. It is a fact strangely overlooked by our Union friends in the North, and their armies who come to fight our enemies, that there are many thoroughly loyal men who are pro-slavery from sentiment. Such men can not understand why they should be made scapegoats for the sins of the secessionists. For in the midst of persecutions, at a time when it cost a man something to stand up for the Union, they have held firm, and given themselves and their sons to fight for their only acknowledged country. They can not understand why they, who have always opposed the traitorous movements of fire-eaters, should now be included in an indiscriminate proscription, as is frequently done by thoughtless and wicked men who come to our state fully possessed of the idea that there are no loyal men here. While these are great and just grievances, we ought to remember that such conduct is not by the order of the Government, nor countenanced by it; but war turns loose many lawless men, who are only too glad for an opportunity to run riot with those passions which the restraints of peace kept chained. Besides, if others forget that we are loyal, we must never ourselves forget that fact; and therefore it behooves us to submit to the losses and endure the abuses which we sometimes suffer; for while undeserved and grievous, they are still of the same kind which all who maintain the cause of the Union have to endure. Hence, if called to suffer still more in the subjugation of the enemy, and surrender, as the result of a military necessity (the only case we are satisfied in which this can occur), our rights in slave property secured to us by the faith of our Government; it by no means follows that we ought to prove recreant to our country, which did protect us in all our rights while in its power to do so, when, through necessity growing out of the present crisis, it invades any of our institutions. The only case where the Executive has done any thing to which true men could object, or where there is any ground of apprehension in the future, is that where slave property is involved. After we have poured out our treasure like water, after we have surrendered our homes to be desolated by war, after we have given our sons without

grudging to lay down their lives, shall we falter? Shall we hesitate to yield that which has been the cause of our troubles; which the civilization of the world disapproves; and which we as emancipationists would be glad to be rid of? Surely we are not prepared as the disunionists are to accommodate the language of a noted secessionist—*Skin for skin, all a man hath will he give for his—nigger!*

It is sincerely to be hoped that the General Government will never present the issue of taking away the slaves of loyal men. On the contrary, we trust that the President and his advisers, by attending to that which seems to us their legitimate duty, will be able to end the war successfully and let us manage our municipal affairs in the way which seems good to us; and which we at least think we understand far better than our neighbors. But if the alternative be presented, to yield to interference or turn against our country, and give our aid to those whose principles we hate, and who have plunged us into all our evils, the course for us is plain. It would perhaps be very humbling to our pride, and certainly unjust to our patriotism; but preferable to treason and in the end more satisfactory. For while as patriots we had better suffer wrong than to be guilty of injustice; so also, as a matter of pure selfishness, it is better to permit the Government to do that which, if it does at all, will do reluctantly to us as friends, and therefore with some regard to our prejudices and interests, than by becoming enemies compel it to do the same by violence. For we are well assured the Government will triumph, whichever way we go, and it will thoroughly accomplish all it finds necessary to the complete subjugation of its enemies; so that our only safe as well as loyal course lies in obedience. Moreover, no man who is not blind can fail to see that slavery is destined to perish as one result of this insurrection. The secessionists see and acknowledge now, what Union men in and out of the border states foretold would be the effect of their mad course. In the words of the *Richmond Whig*: "Slavery has sinned against itself; it has bitten itself to death; it has committed the unpardonable sin, and must die the death." Now this being acknowledged as the inevitable consequence (and brought about by the insurgents themselves), what can it avail the border states to hold on to this system to their own undoing? Why should



that which must die out of natural decay as soon as there is a cordon of free states all around, be made the condition of traitorous affiliation with our common enemy? By holding on to our Government we may safely cross the stream of civil war; but if for the shadow of slavery we let go what we have, and plunge madly after our *rights*, we will lose all and be lost ourselves. Added to this, it has been, as before shown, the desire of good and thoughtful men, even from our earliest history, to get rid of the institution by emancipation. For it is, to say the least, a social evil, a great disadvantage to the white race, as retarding the development of industrial resources; and degrading to labor by raising unnatural distinctions in society. There is very little doubt that, could a vote have been taken on the merits of the question, without intimidation or bribery by the slave interest, and without our jealousies being inflamed by outside interference, the lawful voters of every border slave state would have favored gradual emancipation. It is certainly true that this sentiment is strong in these states; and this change is looked forward to by the better class of men as one which is very desirable, and which must soon have taken place, despite the bolstering up of worn out politicians and a truckling press, even had secession not hastened it. So that it practically resolves itself into the time and manner of doing the work. But we hold that in both respects it is far better for the General Government to let us do our own work in the way our judgment dictates, both for the sake of master and servant. For the violent changes of society are always attended with evil to all parties concerned; a fact which the anti-slavery party in the North leave entirely out of view, and appear to consider nothing more to be necessary than universal and instant emancipation; whereas when this is *un fait accompli*, then the real difficulties of the case are just begun. Those negroes which the Government has already freed as the necessary result of the progress of the war, are more than can be provided for, as is witnessed by the terrible sufferings of this class, despite the assistance rendered from every quarter; and as the work of subjugating the traitors progresses, the master will run from, and the slave toward, the Union armies, until the entire servile population of the seceded states will require protection. To carry on the war successfully and provide for the wants of those



who fall into the Federal lines, is a task quite as large as the Government appears to be able to accomplish. However, if it be in any way necessary for crushing the rebellion that we suffer the inconvenience of a hasty and violent change, we must yield; and it is expedient for us in view of our present situation, as well as the part of loyalty, to do so cheerfully and heartily. For if our friends in the northern states are willing, in order to crush out a rebellion which *they* believe was caused by slavery alone, to saddle themselves with three-fourths of a debt of two thousand million dollars, and give a million and a half from the flower of their youth, we ought certainly, for the preservation of our country united, yield up that which has always been a distracting influence, and is in itself of doubtful expediency.

Such are some of the duties of loyal men growing out of our present condition, viewed with reference to our relations to the General Government on the one hand and slavery on the other. There are other duties more specific in kind, but more general in application, the consideration of which is equally pertinent to the times; but which are too often neglected by those professing themselves to be patriots. It is a self-evident truth that no government can be infallible; and hence, with the best intentions on the part of rulers, blunders and wrongs will be frequently committed, and that these are to be pardoned on the general ground of the infirmity which clings to all things human. So long as the legislator conserves the rights committed to his keeping with ordinary integrity, his minor defects are to be pardoned and concealed. In our democratic policy we have the oft-recurring and easy remedy of popular elections, if our public servants betray their trusts; and the danger is rather in the frequency of the change and unbridled licentiousness of condemnation, than in tyrannical impunity. It is far from being the purpose to advocate the screening of public servants when they jeopard our welfare; but it is necessary to be faithful to them while their purposes are right in the main. In peace these things can regulate themselves, and our liberties are quite as safe, being guarded by the Argus eyes of party, as the good name of our rulers is from unwarranted attacks. But when our country is involved, as at this time, in a struggle calling for the resources of the nation, the united energies of

the people are required for the undivided support of our Government battling for its existence. Party spirit must then be dropped, names forgotten, and side issues neglected in meeting the overwhelming dangers which threaten. For at such a time there ought to be but one party, but one interest; and can be except at our peril, but an homologous and undivided counsel. All that contributes to this result adds to the strength of the nation; all that opposes does but distract the counsels and weaken the chances for success. But in this hour of trial we find multitudes both North and South who can not rise above the mists of a groveling party selfishness, nor see in our present stupendous struggle anything more than an ordinary political contest. And because they possess no patriotism themselves, they can not credit the Government with any; and all its acts which do not quadrate with their own narrow selfishness are denominated tyrannical, because measured by their own traitorous standards.

This kind of opposition manifests itself under protean shapes, but usually can be reduced to two or three kinds. Of these the most common is the pretended danger of the Constitution from the encroachments of military power. The most blatant defenders of the inviolability of this instrument, those whose eyes have long been a fountain of tears, whose sorrow refuses to be comforted, appear to have made Richmond, Virginia, their especial haunt. From this precious nest of traitors we have had jeremiads which sounded like the wailings for a first born, "lest that time-honored document, the Constitution of the United States, might be endangered by that tyrant enthroned at Washington, and his hireling minions." One would think from the earnestness wherewith they lamented its supposed desecration, they were the special conservators of our palladium of liberty. But all these traitors really desired was to have the exclusive monopoly of rending the Constitution into a thousand fragments. Whatever they did, whether it be to steal the public property, to destroy the Government, and kill without mercy all who stood up for the country of their fathers, was right and constitutional; but the moment measures were taken for their punishment, either in person or estate, then, lo! the Constitution was violated; and they its very loyal supporters were very much alarmed lest *they should be pun-*

ished. This sore lamentation of the traitors at Richmond was immediately taken up in heart-rending notes, by all in sympathy with treason throughout the country, and one might justly suppose from the frequency and persistency wherewith secession sympathizers spoke of maintaining the inviolability of this instrument, that its guardians were numerous enough and sufficiently vigilant to defend it from all injury. But these same persons think it quite consistent with their loud pretensions to daily violate the oath they have taken to the Federal power; to aid the enemy by men and money; to refuse to support our armies engaged in suppressing an insurrection; and to openly express a desire for secession to succeed in dismembering and destroying our country. Out on such hypocritical regard for the Constitution. Away with all such fears lest Mr. Lincoln transcends his prerogatives when punishing those in manifest sympathy with rebellion. When we find any one exceedingly exercised lest some scoundrel be abridged of the liberty to utter treason, we are compelled to think "there is something rotten in Denmark," that is in the devotion which such men profess for the Constitution, and have no difficulty in telling the extent of his loyalty. For when any traitor like Vallandigham is cut short in his coöperation with the enemy, then a great hue and cry is raised that personal liberty is endangered. But personal liberty to do what? To raise and encourage insurrection; to resist the Government in its efforts to preserve its own existence; for what else did he desire, whither else did all his efforts tend? What influence do such men as Fernando Wood and Governor Seymour exert save to play into the hands of our common enemy? If we desire proof of this, take the utterances of the southern press, which always speak of these men as their friends; and show that the hope of ultimate triumph is based largely on the diversions which such disaffected leaders make against the Government. Moreover, we see unmistakably that our enemies abroad look to such miscreants as the means of weakening and finally destroying our Union. That mendacious publication, *Blackwood's Magazine*, which is clearly and unequivocally secession in its sympathies (not that it loves the South any better than the North; but sees in the success of the former the ruin of both), utters precisely the same slanders against our rulers and their supporters, that our

home traitors and their brethren in the South continually employ.

None cried out more lustily to be let alone than those wretches who began the war by firing on the starving garrison at Fort Sumter, unless it be the cowardly sneaks among us who were in sympathy. So fearful were they lest the Constitution might be endangered by Mr. Lincoln's call for volunteers, and thus sedition punished, that they would suffer its utter overthrow by an armed enemy in front, and the peace man in the rear. Surely this is straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel. But who that is truly patriotic, that wishes to see our Government succeed in crushing this rebellion, has suffered by the suspension of the habeas corpus act? Every true man is safe; and traitors in arms and their cowardly sympathizers deserve nothing but the gibbet, or the prison until they submit. Some, however, urge that while it is right for those who among us aid treason to be punished, yet this being provided for in a legal way, the military power should not interfere with the civil administration; but offenders should be tried by the regular courts and suffer the legitimate punishments. But those who utter such sentiments are either very silly or very treacherous. As well might Jeff. Davis be arraigned before the United States District Court for the District of Virginia, as Vallandigham before the court for the Southern District of Ohio. Here, among his own sympathizers (whom we know to be generally as disloyal as any man in South Carolina), with the right of challenging the jurymen, he could never be convicted; for care would be taken to have a packed jury; and the result would be either acquittal or prolongation of the suit indefinitely. Everybody knows this perfectly, and therefore the remedy proposed is simply none at all. It is absurd to think that the Government is to be left without any resource, the sport of its enemies and the scorn of its friends. If courts and the ordinary administration of the Constitution be sufficient, wherefore do we resort to arms? Send Chief Justice Taney, under a flag of truce, to Richmond to try Jeff. Davis for treason. Choose Benjamin for prosecuting attorney, with Humphrey Marshall and Wigfall for the defense. Empanel a jury from the persons who represent Kentucky and Tennessee in the Southern congress. Let the Constitution, as inter-

puted by those who have trampled it under foot, reign in all its glory, and then we would have traitors' carnival. But if we find this not to work well, and send our Grants and Bankses to try the traitors at Chattanooga and New Orleans, where is the difference if we send Burnside armed with "No. 38" to Dayton, Ohio. We certainly have the same right to fight the enemy at home as abroad; in Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky, as in Virginia or Tennessee; and, if need be, with the same weapons. For it is plain that the enemy put themselves out of the reach of the constitutional remedy in both places, either by annulling it or placing a false construction on its provisions; and whenever it is found insufficient in application, then we must resort to the arbitrament of the sword. It would be strange indeed if a people made an instrument like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable; and then when found inadequate to preserve the life of that people for whom it was formed, they must die politically; because, while able to save themselves by new expedients found suited to the exigencies of the occasion, they must, *nolens volens*, hold fast to that which is unable to deliver them. Mariners are often compelled to throw out part of the cargo, or even the ship's tackling in the midst of a storm, to save themselves and the vessel; or even abandon the ship itself when stranded among the breakers, and escape by swimming to the shore. The people were before the Constitution, and are therefore above it, on the principle that the man who built the house is greater than the house. They would survive if there were no Constitution, and could form another. But where is the use of a Constitution if there is no people for it to govern? Self-preservation is the first law of Nature, and we are permitted to make use of all expedients to effect this, except to do wrong. What is true of individuals is equally true of nations; and no one but the traitors who have left their country for their country's good, and are waiting and watching over the border, or their equally guilty confederates who yet live by the lenity of our laws to sow discord among us, complain of martial law for doing that which the civil law in its ordinary application is inadequate to effect. Far be it from any true patriot to desire to see the ordinary forms of law neglected or the Constitution infringed. On the contrary, all loyal men look upon these as the bulwark of civil liberty, and depre-

cate the terrible necessity of resorting to the martial process. But at the same time the punishment of traitors by extraordinary means does not affect us with particular grief; and until patriotic men are endangered, of which, at the present writing, there is not the least apparent danger, we can see no special reason for condemning the President for the course he has taken. In fact we have more tears for the thousands of brave men who are starving in prisons at Richmond as the result of a violated Constitution; we are far more distressed for the multitudes of sick and wounded men languishing in hospitals; for the homes made desolate throughout our country; for the hosts of noble fellows who, amid the snows of winter and the showers of summer, are fighting our common enemy, than for the apprehension and summary punishment of the sneaking cowards who are doing the work of their traitorous friends in the South. Truly loyal men will coöperate with the Government in punishing treason, whether by regular civil process or not. And indeed it is far better to save the life of a patient, even if this can not be done by rule, than that his death should occur though Hippocrates and Galen stood at the bedside.

The charge of venality and corruption is often brought against the Government as a sufficient pretext for our withdrawal from its support. Doubtless this is frequently a true charge—we have had corruptions under previous presidents. Mr. Buchanan's administration was not above suspicion, though he had as his supporters nearly all those who blame the present one. We have had defaulters in times of peace; contractors who made fortunes by swindling the Government; and such is likely to be the case to some extent in all places and times until the race of politicians is made of new material. If this can not be avoided in peace, much less can it in war; for then the regular working of the laws is deranged so that bad men can do their mischief and escape detection. Without the most manifest injustice this can not be charged to the fault of the Administration, unless it connives at abuses, nor in any condition be made a justification of disloyalty. We well know that officials in high places have been summarily ejected for their complicity in fraud; and the searching examinations made daily in every branch of service give assurance that corrupt men will not be tolerated after discovery. If we were justified



in standing aloof for such a cause, then surely there could be no patriotism in any land. But we forget that there was an Arnold in the Revolution. The English when villifying our Government for venality do not seem to remember Marlborough and Bacon. The Russian dominion is most arbitrary in its sway, and summary in the execution of punishments for unfaithfulness in office; yet peculation and malfeasance were, during the Crimean war, manifested to an extent wholly unheard of among us. Our Executive and his chief advisers can not justly be charged with lack of integrity in the management of the public funds; and if others who are trusted prove unfaithful, the employers should not be deserted; but it is rather the duty for those who discern the great abuses to rally to the support of the Administration, and by their honesty redeem us from our miseries. However, from the experience we have had with those who clamor most, when they once were in power, we do not desire to see their services accepted. Most of our departments have been managed with such wisdom during Mr. Lincoln's term as to deserve all praise, and have disarmed the slander of such as were not blind to justice. No prime minister of England had ever more perplexing tasks, or executed them with greater fidelity, than several of our secretaries of bureaus since the war began.

The charge which is constantly brought by disloyal persons against the present Administration, that it drags the war along in order to perpetuate its own existence, is an insinuation which carries falsehood on its very face. For the contrary course is so clearly the one to insure the lasting favor of the people, that if this war could be brought to a successful and speedy issue, Mr. Lincoln would at once secure for himself a position second only to that of Washington. Nothing in the gift of the American people would be too good for the President and his advisers who had brought us honorably and safely through this perilous war. On the contrary, the continuance of hostilities tries our patience, depletes our treasury, and destroys our best men. But we look for the struggle to be ended too soon. Few wars of half the magnitude have progressed as rapidly and successfully as this has done for the Federal arms. One year more such as the last, will utterly exhaust the resources of the secessionists. And yet this is a civil war, which is of all kinds the most tedious.



Even if the Government was guilty of great wrongs, greater than the opposition charge, it does not follow that it is the duty of the patriot to expose its misdeeds in such a way as to make capital for the enemy. The patriot may mourn in secret over the errors of that government he loves; and the more loyal he is the more will he lament its faults, as we grieve for the misdeeds of a friend just in proportion to the hold he possesses on our affections. The son who, when his father was on trial for his life, or his mother's good name jeopardied, would go into the court or among the gossips at the street corners, and disclose every idle word and venial fault of which he has been cognizant in their conduct, would not be considered as possessing natural affection or common sense. Nature teaches us by the holiest instincts of the heart to stand up for those we love, through evil report; and help sustain the burdens which their follies and sins may have brought upon them. History gives us one very noteworthy instance to the contrary; but the curse which is supposed by many scriptural advocates of African slavery to have followed the descendants of the offender, does not give much encouragement for us to follow the example if we have regard to the welfare of our posterity. But the son who went backwards that he might not see the shame of his father, and then threw the covering to hide the exposure from others, received a blessing; not that he approved the sin of drunkenness, not that he would encourage its repetition; but because the one guilty was his parent, and as a son he was jealous of his honor. So let us take warning for the guidance of our conduct, since our country is far more to us than the welfare of a father or the honor of a mother, however precious these be to every true son, as Socrates has well expressed: "Are you so wise as not to know, that a man's country is more precious, more venerable and sacred, and in greater estimation both among gods, and men that have sense, than mother and father and all other progenitors; and that one ought to reverence, yield to and soothe, one's country when angry, rather than one's father; and either persuade it or do what it orders; and to suffer quietly if it bids one suffer, whether to be beaten or put in bonds; or if it sends one to battle, to be wounded or slain; this must be done for it is just; and one must not give back, or retreat, or leave his post; but that both in war and in the civil court, and every where, one must

do what his city and country enjoins, or persuade it in the way justice allows."—*Plato, Crito*, 51 B. C.

There are, in truth, only two parties in our country, the Unionists and the Secessionists—there can be no middle ground, and those who are not for us in this struggle are against us. Hence every act and word, which weakens the hands of our rulers in their attempt to subdue our enemies, does but strengthen the foe. This can be done in no way more effectually than by withdrawing the moral support which a good name affords. It is therefore vain for any to say they are Union men, as may be heard any day among the copperheads of the North, or of this state, and at the same time perpetually attack the Government in all its measures. Those persons who say so much to the disparagement of the loyal Government, that they must, from time to time, make public proclamations that they are Union men in order for that fact to be even suspected, and make vehement asseverations of their patriotism as a kind of salvo for continual expressions of disloyalty—surely from such friends may the Republic pray to be delivered.

Closely connected with the foregoing in effect, if not always in animus, is the class of croakers, who are perpetually prophets of evil—birds of ill omen, who, whether they rise up on the right hand or the left, true to their native instincts, fly toward the South. We do not mean trimmers, who are precisely what the company is; who are for the Union or for Secession according to the prospects of the political horizon. These have no claim to loyalty, but it is a happy thought that they are harmless; for though, like the drone bee, they make a great fuss, yet they have no sting. Such persons are no help to either party, for they are too cowardly to fight and too weak to have any weight in counsel. They try to please all and therefore are trusted by none. But this is not the class meant. It is that one composed of those unfortunates who see nothing but disaster, where others see victory; who would not fight (not that they lack the courage, but) because they feel certain beforehand they would be whipped; who always have bad news, and rise up before day to tell it; and then, if it be subsequently contradicted forget to make the proper correction. Such persons magnify each advantage of the enemy into a decisive victory and belittle every success of our arms till it vanishes into air. When news

of different sorts comes they have "three ears" to hear the bad, but are deaf as the adder to the report of the good. And the same dispositions make them seers for the future. While continually uttering prophecies of adversity, of course something, from time to time, does, according to their fancy, prove true; and straightway they wear the hairy garment to deceive. Such persons gather around them those of like feelings, and weaken each other's courage until they utterly despair of the Republic; for the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er by their pale cast of thought. Sometimes this rabies assumes the higher forms of criticism, and we have elaborate and, without exception, unfavorable dissertations on civil and military matters. For these critics feel themselves so thoroughly able to guide the State and hound on the dogs of Mars, that they are "the men;" and because they are likely to die without their sagacity being appreciated, the state will assuredly perish, since "wisdom will die with them." Such persons are so wise that they know by intuition more than others do by long years of persevering study; and much like the Greek sophists, are able to speak equally well on all subjects. They proclaim with the most complacent certainty that our generals are all fools, and our cabinet officers numbskulls. While our foreign relations have been conducted with so much prudence, amid many vexatious and dangerous complications, as to extort praise from inimical publicists of Europe; while our currency has been so successfully managed as to astonish us all, these critics go on berating our Government advisers without limit: never seeming to remember that their foolish predictions, of a year ago, have been utterly falsified by subsequent facts. If such would altogether hold their peace, this, at least, would prove their wisdom. Such persons are far more injurious than if they were in the ranks fighting against us. For if they were with the foe, unless their nature was entirely changed, they would spread dismay by their lugubrious vaticinations and disparaging criticisms. Possibly a man of this character may be loyal, but surely his loyalty is not of the kind to inspire confidence in the times which try men's souls. That loyalty which is worth the name never despairs. It accepts every vigorous measure against the enemy as an augury of good; supports the Government in matters of doubtful expediency, even for the sake of avoiding divided

counsels; and forsakes not the legitimate ruler because through frailty he may do wrong, or not achieve that measure of success hoped for. It considers the labors and perplexities, the anxieties and watchings which distract those high in authority; and affords honor and sympathy corresponding to their trials. It rises equal to the occasion, and if darkness surrounds, it can by its own faith strike out a light to dispel the gloom. That loyalty never doubts since it believes its cause right, and that God will maintain the right; and because he can save by many or few—this, and this alone, is worthy the name of patriotism—this, and this alone, revives the drooping spirits after defeat, and prevents the relaxation of sloth after victory.

---

ART. V.—DISLOYALTY IN THE CHURCH. *The Mt. Pleasant Church Case in and out of the Church Courts.*

DURING the summer of 1860, the writer was unanimously called to the pastoral charge of two churches in Harrison county, Kentucky: one of them located in Cynthiana, the county town, and the other about five miles distant from this place. Here he commenced his ministerial work, and was permitted to pursue it without any disturbance or dissension, and with much hopefulness, until the winter of 1861 and 1862, a period of a little over a year after the election of the present Chief Magistrate of the Nation. A majority of the people among whom he had been called to labor, from the beginning of our national troubles, were in sympathy with those who had revolted against the authorities of the land, and, as a consequence, early in the winter of 1862, symptoms of disaffection appeared among the disloyal members of the Mt. Pleasant church towards their pastor, because he would not surrender to a sentiment which regarded treason neither as a *crime* against the laws of the land nor as a *sin* against God. Measures therefore were inaugurated by disloyal persons, whereby the peace of that church was to be destroyed and the pastor to be sacrificed, because unwilling to coöperate in projects which neither his conscience nor patriotism could approve. To prevent such results and to resist such aggressions of disturbers upon the

peace and harmony of the church; the good of not merely this particular church, but of the whole church of Kentucky and of the border slave states, and his own personal character, exacted of him to stand firmly in his lot, no matter at what cost or suffering, and do in the midst of these perilous times what his Master required of him. With the rebel population of the county, rebel leaders in the county town, and some of the rebel office-bearers of the Presbytery to which the writer belonged intensely interested in the case, and ready, many of them, to coöperate with this disloyal movement, the history of the case and the principles evolved are matters of interest to the entire church in the loyal states. Now that the pastoral relation between the writer and the Mt. Pleasant church, at his own request, has been dissolved; and now that he has seen triumph in our church courts those principles for which he has struggled: he feels it due to the cause of truth and righteousness, for the guidance of others, to lay this whole case open to the public view. That the ministry and people of God in the loyal states may know and see the steps through which persistent and obstinate disturbers will lead or force them, the record of this case, the first in Kentucky where the disloyal element of one of our congregations, having assumed an organized form for the purposes of mischief and trouble, was resisted in and out of the church courts, is thus submitted, to the end that such results in the future may be averted.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS FROM FEB., 1862, TO SPRING MEETINGS OF WEST LEXINGTON PRESBYTERY OF APRIL AND MAY, 1863, AND PAPERS INVOLVED.

At the spring meeting of the Presbytery, April 14, 1862, at Cherry Spring, in Scott county, the *case*, by reference from the session, was first submitted to that court for adjudication. The release of Feb., 1862, indelicately submitted to the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church by Elder T. D. Urmston, *drawn up* by him, and intended to entrap the pastor ere the conspiracy was discovered, together with the so-called *petition* of five members (with one withdrawn), prepared by the same elder, and submitted to them on the 13th of March, 1862, at a country sale, after the first project had failed, and the *sessional reference* of Sabbath, 23d of March, 1862, are all here appended in papers

A, B and C. In his *formal replication* to Presbytery of April, 1863, herein published, the pastor has stated all that is necessary touching these papers beyond what is embodied in the action of the Presbytery upon the case at its meeting at Cherry Spring. This action is here appended in paper D.

*A.—Release of Feb., 1862, prepared by T. D. U.*

Where as I Rev Geo. Morrison was installed on the 3rd day of October, 1860, Pastor of Mt Pleasant church, the church or congregation, by a unanimous vote chose the members of the session to sign an obligation for them promising to pay me the sum of three hundred dollars as an annual salary to be paid in semiannual payments & where as some of the members subscribers whose subscriptions have been liberal have recently *died* (and others members of the congregation have declined giving support to the church), I here by do agree with the members of session T. Wornell, Wm Lowry & T. D. Urmston to release them from any and all obligations to pay me any thing more than they may get subscribed and paid to them by the congregation together with their own personal subscription given from under my hand this                      day of                      1862.

*B.—Petition of March 13, 1862.*

To the West Lexington Presby. Having paid the Rev Geo. Morrison, all that we individually subscribed—also all that we could collect by subscription—being disabled by the death of some & the refusal of others for the making up the salary promised & believing that the Pastoral relation between the Rev Geo. Morrison & the Mt Pleasant church ought no longer to be continued, we the under signed, Elders and Members of the afore said church respectfully request of Presbytery the dissolution of the afore said relation.

WM. LOWRY  
THOS. WORNELL  
T. D. URMSTON  
JAMES GRAY  
SAM. ALLISON

*Withdrawal of Wm. Lowry.*—On the 13 of March at Mr. Basset's sale at the request of Mr. Urmston I signed a paper requesting a dissolution of the Pastoral relation between Mr. Morrison & the Broadwell church—at that time I made objections to doing this, but was over-persuaded to sign the same—Being now convinced that such act was unwise and is illegal according to (chap xvii of fr of gov) I desire my name to be considered as erased from such paper.

(Signed) WM. LOWRY.

*C.—Sessional Reference of March 23, 1862.*

The session of this church are informed by the committee of the church to whom is entrusted the matter of raising the Pastor's salary, that there will be a deficiency for present year, as to the amount promised to the Pastor in the call & session being further informed that said committee feel themselves bound for the amount of said subscription, desire the Presbytery to direct what action shall be taken in the case to relieve said committee in behalf of congregation from such responsibility.

D.—*Presbyterial Action.*

1. In the matter of the Mount Pleasant church, the petition of five members of the congregation, of whom one had his name stricken off before the petition came to Presbytery, can not be considered an application *by the congregation* in the sense of Chapter XVII of the Form of Government.

2. That, so far as the Presbytery understands the facts of the case, the conduct of Messrs. Urmston and Wornell, ruling Elders in said congregation, has been in this matter unwise; unkind to their Pastor, injurious to the peace of the congregation, and without warrant in the constitution of the Presbyterian church.

3. The congregation of Mount Pleasant is hereby exhorted to be at peace amongst themselves, and to avoid all things that tend to confusion, disorder and schism; and the Elders of the church are directed to pursue such a course as will unite the people in the support and comfort of the gospel, and uphold and encourage their Pastor in his work.

4. The stated clerk is directed to send a certified copy of this minute to the Pastor of the Mt. Pleasant congregation, who is directed to read it from the pulpit of that church on the first Sabbath day there is preaching there after he receives said certified copy.

The above is a true copy of a paper passed by the Presbytery of West Lexington this 14th of April, 1862.

J. K. LYLE, S. C.

At a meeting of this same Presbytery, held at the Mt. Pleasant church, September 9, 1862, when the state was occupied by the Confederate armies under Bragg and Kirby Smith, and when the pastor was within the Federal lines at Covington, the disloyal members of the church again renewed their efforts to consummate their projects, up to this time baffled. This Presbytery consisted of seven persons—three of them ministers the Rev. W. H. Forsyth, the Rev. D. P. Young and the Rev. Matthew Vanlear, and four of them elders, to wit: Glass Marshall, Charles Nichols (now dead), T. D. Urmston and J. W. Risk. Three of these elders represented the churches of the ministers present, and the fourth, T. D. Urmston, of the Mt. Pleasant church, sat without legal warrant. The Presbytery thus constituted received a paper at this meeting from said disloyal faction, and referred it to an adjourned meeting of the Presbytery at Versailles in Woodford county, September 25, still sitting within the lines of an invading and hostile army. This Presbytery, consisting of seven ministers and five ruling elders, granted the request of said petitioners, and appointed one of their number, the Rev. D. P. Young, to go into the Mt. Pleasant congregation and call and preside over a congregational meeting to oust their pastor in his absence and without his knowledge. The gentleman appointed to hold this congre-



gational meeting was ordered to report to an adjourned meeting of same Presbytery, to be held at Paris Oct. 9, 1862. Oct. 1, such meeting was held, previous notice having been given, not only by the Rev. F. G. Strahan (who occupied the pulpit of the Mt. Pleasant church on the 28th of September, 1862, without the invitation of the pastor), but also given by one of the disaffected elders to persons of the congregation at their homes. In the proceedings of that meeting but twelve persons took any part. At Paris, October 9, 1862, the Commissioner, the Rev. D. P. Young, who had presided over the above meeting, and who had been instructed to report at this meeting, was present. So also were the Rev. W. H. Forsyth and the Rev. F. G. Strahan, and the parties of the church who had so zealously sought to prosecute this matter to an issue during the reign of the Confederate powers, and yet the case was not formally submitted to that court. In a published notice of July, 1863, in the *Cincinnati Gazette* of the career of the Rev. F. G. Strahan, touching the affairs of this church, the writer has assigned two probable reasons why this case was not reported and acted upon. These were: 1. The presence of Dr. Breckinridge, a loyal minister; and 2. The probable defeat of Bragg on a previous day at Perryville. A third one, assigned by them afterwards, was that the temporary clerk was absent.

Such was the condition of things in the Mt. Pleasant church on the 27th of October, 1862, when the pastor returned to the state and reoccupied his pulpit. Thus matters stood until the spring meeting of the Presbytery at Nicholasville, April, 1863, the gospel being regularly preached by the pastor. The pastor being in feeble health, before going to said Presbytery, had drawn up a statement of grievances against this disloyal faction of the church, and against those who had been so conspicuous in promoting this conspiracy of these disturbers in that church, which grievances he had judged were grounds why he should ask a dissolution of the relation between him and said church. Such letter of resignation had been prepared. It was his desire no longer to have been subject to such encroachments as he had borne from those so determined upon trouble. But the opinion of those whom he had learned to respect, was that these encroachments should be resisted by every method of redress provided for by the laws of the church.

The peace and welfare of the church at large required this at his hands, and therefore to these ends he felt constrained ere the Presbytery had convened. The report of the Commissioner upon the congregational meeting of October 1, 1862, up to this time withheld, was at this meeting called for by the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church, which was thereupon filed. Said *report*, together with the pastor's *replication*, also then filed at said meeting of Presbytery, the first after his return to the state, and the *statement* elicited by this from the Rev. F. G. Strahan, are herewith inserted in papers F, G, and H. Petition also of disloyal faction to Presbytery of September 9, 1862, above alluded to, is also here appended in paper E.

*E.—Petition of Thomas Wornell, T. D. Urmston and others.*

We, the undersigned members of the church and congregation of Mt. Pleasant church, respectfully present to the Presbytery of West Lexington the following statement of facts and accompanying petition:

The Rev. George Morrison was called to the pastoral charge of this church, in connection with the Cynthiana church and settled as pastor in October, 1860. He was not the first choice of this church; but the action of the church in Cynthiana having been taken without consultation with us, and precluding the possibility of our settling the man we wished, we did, upon the earnest counsel and advice of certain members of this Presbytery, and for the sake of peace and union, agree to the settlement of Mr. Morrison. It was very soon apparent that our new pastor was not an acceptable preacher nor calculated to give satisfaction to the people, and the dissatisfaction has been steadily increasing ever since. Last spring the elders of this church, thinking that there would be difficulty in collecting the amount of salary promised, and supposing that by the terms of the call they were personally bound for the whole amount, applied to Mr. Morrison for a release from the supposed obligation. This he promptly refused. They then asked him if he would join with the church in a request to Presbytery for a dissolution of the pastoral relation. He replied that he would if the people desired it, but peremptorily refused to call a meeting of the congregation to learn their wishes, stating as the ground of his refusal that it would introduce politics into the church. In this refusal he has persisted up to this time. In this state of things a petition was sent to Presbytery, signed by only a few names, for a dissolution under the supposition that it would lead to an investigation of the extent of the dissatisfaction in the church. The fate of that paper and the effect of the movement is well known to Presbytery, and we believe that the action of Presbytery at that time was owing to the not being in possession of all the facts in the case, and therefore we herein state them more fully.

On the 25th day of May last Mr. Morrison was requested by two of the elders to call a meeting of the session, which he arbitrarily refused to do, until assured that the sole object of the desired meeting was to grant certain letters of dismission. After the meeting was organized a petition for a congregational meeting, signed by a majority of the actual supporters of the pastor, was presented to him

by a member of the session who had not joined in the call for a meeting of the session. This paper he declared out of order and unconstitutional, and put it in his pocket and refused to give it up to the session whose property it was.

Seeing therefore no prospect of obtaining a meeting of the people to express our grievances to Presbytery in the regular way, and being profoundly and sadly impressed with the belief that the interests of the church are suffering greatly, and that this state of things is not likely to become better, but rather certain to become worse, we do earnestly petition and entreat Presbytery to interpose and at least to direct a meeting of the congregation to be called that they may express their mind in the matter.

We beg leave also to state here most explicitly, in order to throw off an imputation that has been most persistently cast upon us, that the politics of Mr. Morrison is not the cause of our dissatisfaction with him. Should our relation to him be dissolved we would have no idea of settling any other as pastor over us than one loyal and true to the Government under which we live.

July 13, 1862. Thomas Wornell, T. D. Urmston, James Gray, J. W. Urmston, Mary Gray, Nannie Gray, Maggie Gray, Minerva Gray, Martha E. Gray, Leah Webster, Rebecca Wornell, Helen T. Kimbrough, Sare McCluer, Margaret Millner, Mary Cook, Josie Urmston, Samuel Allison.

A true copy of a paper filed with me.

J. K. LYLE, Stated Clerk of West Lexington Presbytery.

*F.—Report of Rev. D. P. Young.*

Having been previously appointed by Presbytery to attend and preside over a congregational meeting at Mt. Pleasant church at such time as they might designate, I now report that duty performed. I presided over such a meeting October 1st, 1862. After preaching a sermon, I stated the object of my presence; that their delegate at the last meeting of Presbytery stated it was the desire of the majority of their session, as well as many of the congregation, to have a congregational meeting with a view of ascertaining whether they would continue the pastoral relation existing between themselves and the Rev. George Morrison; also that they desired some brother might be sent to preside over such a meeting. I stated I was present for that purpose, provided previous notification had been given such a meeting would be held. I was informed such notification had been given by the Rev. F. G. Strahan twice on a previous Sabbath at the church, that they also had notification thereof by one of the elders at their homes. I then requested some member to state to the congregation what action they desired to take. Whereupon it was moved that we now test the sense of this congregation, whether they desire that initiatory steps be taken at the next meeting of Presbytery for a dissolution of the pastoral relation between Rev. George Morrison and themselves. I then read to them the steps necessary in such a case. Upon taking the vote upon the question there were twelve votes in the affirmative—none to the contrary. I stated there were eighteen names to the petition sent to Presbytery, and as it was a matter of no little importance to a church to dissolve the pastoral relation, or take the steps initiatory thereto, it was the solemn duty each member of the church owed to himself and his church to vote yes or nay, inasmuch also as their vote must have some influence upon the mind of the Presbytery in its decision.

I stated inasmuch as I desired the true sense of the membership upon this subject, I would retake the vote, hoping each one would embrace the opportunity to express his mind by his vote. The vote was retaken with the same result as pre-

viously stated. There being no further business before the congregation the meeting was closed with prayer.

(Signed,)

D. P. Young.

A true copy,

J. K. LYLE, S. C.

G.—*Replication of Rev. George Morrison filed with Presbytery at its Spring Meeting at Nicholasville, April, 1862, to proceedings of disturbers and of previous Meetings of Presbytery during his unavoidable absence from State.*

Sometime in the month of Feb. 1862, at an informal meeting of the members of the Session of the Mount Pleasant church, in my house, it was represented to me that there would be a falling off in the cases of a few who subscribed to my support in that church. At that time a paper drawn up by T. D. Urmston of that Session was handed to me by him with the request that I should sign the same. This paper was in the form of a *release*, and was in the custody of this Presbytery until returned by the stated clerk after the adjournment of the Spring Presbytery of April 1862, upon the private demand of Mr. Urmston. (*Stated clerk filed a paper explanatory of this to which Dr. Breckinridge filed a reply*). This paper recited a state of case which did not exist. It asked of me to do that which I had no power to do, in releasing Mr. Urmston from obligations which he had made with the Presbytery and in making covenant with new parties not known in the call and placed in my hands by the West Lexington Presbytery, and it also required of me to certify to a state of facts which I had no personal knowledge were true. I refused to sign said release, but said to Mr. Urmston that such persons as desired for any cause to withdraw their support from the church, when the case was properly presented, *these* persons I would release. If his representations were true the *method* I proposed was one by which he (Mr. Urmston) would be released from *responsibility* and I from a liability to censure for assuming powers which did not belong to me but to this Presbytery alone. And that the case should be fully understood, I repeated in a letter to one of the persons represented as disaffected, of the date May 17, 1862, what I was prepared to do, and authorized his use of that letter to the end that trouble should be allayed. I repeat, representations were made to me of a probable falling off of subscriptions to my support, which I then thought were *imaginary*, but which the subsequent conduct of Mr. Urmston and others furnishes proof that they have been efficient in trying to produce. Except the small deficit of \$14 50, the pastor's salary has been paid up to September 1862, in that church, and the first persons also who made formal application to me, were Messrs. T. D. Urmston and Wornell and Gray, sometime in November 1862, with the notification that they did not *wish my services and would not pay for them*.

At that time, that is in February 1862, it was agreed, if there were deficiencies as represented, that the gentlemen so representing these things should make efforts to supplant such deficit by new subscriptions from persons who had not heretofore subscribed. Under a breach of covenant these efforts were not made. The persons represented to me in February as *refusing to pay, did pay*. The persons who so represented this state of facts, in Feb. 1862, were two of the three persons (*viz.*, T. D. Urmston and T. Wornell), who notified me as above stated. These persons not only failed to comply with their agreement of Feb. 1862, in regard to efforts to supplant represented deficiencies, but about that time a new subscription paper was drawn up in the handwriting of T. D. Urmston, dating the time when the pastor's salary should begin one month later, than the time of the original subscription list. But to recur to other matters material

to the case. A *petition* drawn up by Mr. T. D. Urmston was presented to three of the members of my church, at the sale of Jonathan Bassets (deceased), on the 13th March, 1862, and to a fourth one at a subsequent day by Mr. Urmston, asking a dissolution of the pastoral relation between myself and the Mount Pleasant church. This petition states no grievances, and of its existence I had no knowledge, nor the slightest intimation thereof until Sabbath the 23d of March, 1862. On that day after I had seated myself at the stove in the church, I was requested to go to the door, when I was informed by Mr. Urmston that the session had determined to ask for a dissolution of the pastoral relation, and desired me to call a meeting of the congregation for that purpose. I then asked the question when that session had had a meeting and by what authority without the knowledge of the moderator, and remarked that there would be a meeting of the session for the purpose of appointing a delegate to the Presbytery, and if he or the session had any such matter to bring before them, there would then be an opportunity. The paper above alluded to at this meeting of the session, was called forth, and the following minute was adopted by the session, but has been *suppressed* from the sessional records of the church (Mr. Urmston acting as clerk), and for reasons which may appear obvious presently. "The session of this church are informed by the committee (this committee were T. D. Urmston and T. Wornell), of the church to whom is entrusted the matter of raising the pastor's salary, that there will be a deficiency for present year in the amount promised to the pastor in the call, and session being further informed that said committee feel themselves bound for amount of said subscription, desire the Presbytery to direct what action shall be taken in the case to relieve said committee in behalf of the congregation from such responsibility." (*This is the reference upon which action of April, 1862, was taken by Presbytery.*)

There had been no such meeting of the session, nor had the moderator of the session and pastor of the church been requested to call a sessional meeting for such purpose. From papers in my hands, the contents of which I am prepared to communicate to the Presbytery, it would seem to have been a foregone conclusion in the mind of Mr. Urmston and those who were prepared to aid him in his divisive course in that church, that the session had so decided—that there should be a dissolution of the pastoral relation. There is not the slightest evidence that any one ever entertained such a proposition until it became a necessity in his judgment that the testimony of a minister loyal to his Master should cease in the community of which he was a member, and Mr. Urmston an elder of the church becomes the willing agent through whom this is to be effected.

The proposition to call a congregational meeting to decide the question whether the pastoral relation should be dissolved, never did come before the session of the Mount Pleasant church, except in the way I have already designated, and again on the 25th of May, in a way involving censure upon the parties implicated. Nor was the pastor requested to convene such session for such purpose so far as he has any knowledge. From the interest exhibited by Messrs. Urmston and Wornell, and by others not connected with that church, I now have no doubt that the real design of a call, one bearing date April 7th, prior to meeting of Presbytery, but subsequent to the action of *reference* alluded to above, of March 23d, and *suppressed* from record, and one on the 25th of April, after the Presbytery had censured Mr. T. D. Urmston and others, had some connection in the minds of Messrs. Urmston and Wornell with such meeting. These calls, which are the only ones made to me, are in my hands, and from these taken in connec-

tion with other papers in my hands, it is obvious that the *avowed* objects of some of them differ from the *real* one.

But the difficulties in this case extend along a period of over 12 months. The *first* stage was ended with the case as it stood submitted to the Presbytery and adjudicated by this court, April 14, 1862, as is seen from the action of Presbytery at that time. The next stage of procedure begins with the above date and closes with the case as it now stands. The pastor of the church was instructed by Presbytery to read the action of the Presbytery, in the case of the Mount Pleasant church, from the pulpit of said church, on the first Sabbath day of preaching, subsequent to his receiving a certified copy of the same. This was Sabbath the 27th day of April. On the 19th of April, after my return home from Presbytery, I addressed a letter to Mr. Urmston. It was my wish, as it had been from the incipency of the troubles, which Mr. Urmston was determined to precipitate upon the church, that they should be allayed. But a proposal to one under the censure of the church for such flagrant misconduct, prompted by a desire to restore relations disturbed by events during a few weeks preceding that time, and to relieve him of personal embarrassment toward me, is ignored so far as our personal relations are concerned. I went farther than this toward fostering a spirit of fraternal intercourse between the brethren of that church, by personal advances which were repulsed, and by public exhortation on the 27th of April. This last while the attention of the congregation was called to the facts, that the Mount Pleasant church during a period of 15 years (more or less), with an interval of 5 years (when the church had no minister), had had some nine ministers; That a membership of several hundred had been reduced to 40, when I became their pastor; That contention and strife had prevailed in their bosom for years, and while each member of that church was called upon to ask himself the question whether he had not some share in producing the state of case in the church; yet this was done in no censorious spirit. At the close of this exhortation the paper of Presbytery was read and no allusion was made to the state of facts upon which the Presbytery had made that declaration. If, in my judgment, silence from the pulpit upon this matter would conduce to the good of that people, I was willing to rest under whatever imputations the zeal of my enemies and the enemies of that church had been active to cast upon me, and while many things came to my knowledge, from that time until August when I was compelled to leave my home, because of the presence of an hostile army, *things* which showed the *bitterness* and *malignity* of those who were seeking my ruin and the ruin of the church, yet I made no public allusions to them, and abstained, moreover, from declaring from the pulpit of the Mount Pleasant church, what I, holding the word of God to be the *rule* of all duty, believe every man must accept, that *loyalty* to God exacts of every Christian *loyalty* to his country.

But the course of those determined to promote discontent, disloyalty, and general alienations in that church; the conduct of those who were ready to disregard pledges and vows solemnly made; of those ready to despise the authority, order, and ordinances of the church and her sacred courts, was in utter antagonism with this, and can not rest until their pastor, who in the midst of such defection around him stood firm in his loyalty to God and country, should be removed from that church. To effect this, the persons conspicuous in this conspiracy do not hesitate to resort to measures, which, because of their immorality, demand the censure of this court of the Lord Jesus Christ.



I will briefly trace this conduct. Before the first preaching Sabbath after the adjournment of Presbytery, in defiance of the action of this court and before I had an opportunity to communicate to my congregation said action, John Urmston, son of T. D. Urmston, and a member of the church, was circulating a paper among the members of my church, and T. D. Urmston was in communication *personally*, and by letter, with several members of this Presbytery to effect the result of my removal from Mount Pleasant church. It will be borne in mind that the parties censured by action of Presbytery of April 14th, 1862, if they considered themselves aggrieved, had a method of redress by appeal or otherwise to a higher court. But this method seemed to commend itself neither to them nor their advisers. The existence of this new paper having the names of 14 persons upon it, and bearing date of April 25th, nearly all of whom are known to be disloyal, was kept from the knowledge of the pastor until within a few days before May 25th, when a sessional meeting was convened under the pretext of dismissing three persons from the Mount Pleasant church to the Beard church. The *real* design of said meeting appears to have been to bring that paper before the session, with a view to increase trouble in the church, and at the same time, as appears from what transpired *then*, compared with a statement in the memorial (of Urmston, Wornell and others to the fall meeting of this Presbytery), to entrap Mr. Lowry into a conspiracy directing all its energies to the ruin of the Mount Pleasant church and its pastor. Sometime early in May of 1862, a like but *unsuccessful* attempt was made to entrap this same gentleman, because he had asked his name to be withdrawn from a paper drawn up by Mr. U. and presented to him March 13th, 1862, and signed by him, because of representations made to him by Messrs. Urmston and Wornell. Touching this memorial to the session bearing date April 25th, 1862, there are some matters demanding your consideration. Of the persons who signed that paper; in one case known to us, she did it upon representations which were false; in another case where the person admitted doing wrong; in another case where the petitioner avowed his purpose to vote against the dissolution. Again, while Mr. T. D. Urmston has professed to know nothing of the existence of this memorial at the time of its being circulated, yet about the 19th of April, he furnished me, at my request, with a certified list of members; in one case among the 24 of those reported as attending church regularly, whose name appears upon the memorial of 14, I do not remember ever to have seen this person in the church since I have been pastor. Several names of regular attendants, known to be of a different mind from Mr. Urmston, are omitted from that class. The *list* appears to have been made to suit the case of the *memorialists*.

This *memorial* circulated in defiance of the order of this Presbytery, signed by a minority of those entitled to vote and circuitously placed in the hands of the moderator (and that too being done in a way to entrap an unsuspecting and pious elder) at a meeting of the session of May 25th, convened ostensibly for another purpose, was ruled out, because not signed by a majority of persons entitled to vote in the case and because in conflict with the order of the Presbytery and schismatical. From the meeting of the Presbytery in April, 1862, to the time of the invasion of the state by an hostile army in August, September and October, in whose lines a Presbytery constituted of a few persons, when the matter of the Mount Pleasant church was brought before that body, September 10th, in a memorial signed by T. D. Urmston and others, but *one regular* call for a meeting, of the session of the Mount Pleasant church was presented to the moderator. This was on the 25th of



April. The avowed object of this call as announced by one of the elders making such call and not dissented from by the other was a *different* one from what seems to have been its design as appears from other papers in my hands. On the 25th of May: The special case alluded to in a *memorial* received by the above-mentioned Presbytery September 10th, and acted upon September 24th, the pastor of the Mount Pleasant church convened the session. The *memorial* states that "on the 25th day of May last, Mr. Morrison was requested by two of the elders to call a meeting of the session, which he arbitrarily [refused] to do until assured that the sole object of the desired meeting was to grant certain letters of dismission." The facts of the case do not justify such a statement. So soon as the congregation had been dismissed by benediction (no previous intimation of such desired meeting having been given to me), Mr. Urmston, and he alone, called out to me from the aisle of the church, myself still in the pulpit, and requested a meeting of the session, causing a commotion in the congregation. The Book provides, ch. ix, sect. vii, how the session shall be convened. He not having complied with the requisitions of the book, and being under the censure of Presbytery, and instructed to study the peace of the Church, I requested him to state the purpose for which such meeting was desired. At this point T. Wornell stepped to his side, and Mr. Urmston stated the object to be, to dismiss certain members to Beard church. The request of these persons was in the hand-writing of Mr. Forsyth. The session was convened. Its object as announced by Mr. Urmston and reaffirmed in the memorial, was to dismiss certain persons; and yet, from same memorial, the object of the call appears to have been a different one. It was at this meeting, that Mr. Urmston made such demonstrations, when Mr. Lowry failed to be entrapped in the case of the petition then presented, as persons present could look at in no other light than contemplated violence against Mr. Lowry.

So matters stood after that meeting of May 25th; so far as I had any personal knowledge, the means of grace being regularly dispensed, until the latter part of August, when this part of the state was overrun by the enemies of our country, and I was compelled to be absent from the field of my labors with a view to personal safety; safety against perils which the conduct of some of the elders of the Mt. Pleasant church, and some of that people had no little hand in producing, because of my loyalty to God and country.

During my absence of two months from the state, while an hostile army were in possession of it, my pulpit at Cynthiana and Mt. Pleasant had been occupied a part of the time by the Rev. F. G. Strahan of this Presbytery, and that too without my invitation. He was a member of the Presbytery which met at Versailles on the 24th of September within the enemy's lines, which ordered the congregational meeting, and was the person who gave notice to the congregation of the ordered meeting, and an appointment was made for him to preach at Mount Pleasant church on Sabbath Oct. 27th, nearly one month after such meeting. During this time also, a *memorial* signed by a minority of those entitled to vote was presented to Presbytery Sept. 10th, and of these signers, in one case, the person had been previously reported to me by Mr. T. D. Urmston as not attending church, nor does this person contribute any thing to the support of the church. Nor is this the only case of a similar nature. In some cases who are reported as signing this memorial, sooner than call in question their veracity, we are disposed to give them credit of signing what they had not examined, or the bearing of which

they were incompetent to see from the paper itself. In the case of a few of them they state and sign what they knew to be false.

Of these petitioners, the elders and others have absented themselves from the means of grace as dispensed in the Mt. Pleasant church by the pastor, from the time of the expulsion of the rebel army from the state in October, 1862, at which time I returned to my field of labor, until now.

Touching the case of T. D. Urmston, efficient in producing the state of case thus laid before you, I have this to say: under various pretexts from time to time he has prosecuted his course disloyal both to God and country; he has despised the authority, the order and ordinances of the church; he has disregarded pledges and ordination vows; he has not scrupled to say things which are untrue; he has neglected the public duties of religion and brought reproach upon the name of Christ; he has been conspicuous in promoting discontent, disloyalty and alienation, tending to trouble and confusion in the church where he has acted as an elder.

Touching the Presbytery of Sept. 10th, which received the memorial of a minority of the congregation in which they were sitting, and that of Sept. 24th, which treated the allegations as embodied in said memorial as true, when its allegations are absolutely or substantially untrue, without making the slightest inquiry about it; and this too being done when they perfectly well knew that the pastor of the church in consequence of his having taken an active part in the defense of his family and neighbours, against a raid of rebel marauders, in the month of July, and because of threats against his life, was compelled to be absent from his home and could not know what was going on: touching a Presbytery composed of a small number of elders, and a still smaller number of ministers (one of these elders being Mr. T. D. Urmston, who sat in the Presbytery without *legal warrant*, and of the whole body, not above one or two being loyal men), sitting within the lines of an invading rebel army, which received this memorial; and touching the adjourned Presbytery of Sept. 25th, still sitting within the lines of the rebel army, which granted the request of such petitioners, under such circumstances, and appointed a minister to go into the Mt. Pleasant congregation and call and preside over a congregational meeting therein, with a view to oust their pastor from the church in his absence, and without his knowledge: I have this to say with deference to the Presbytery which is over me in the Lord; that upon such principles and such proceedings as these, it is impossible to look for any thing but disorder in the churches, and the ruin of the usefulness of ministers, and impossible to reconcile such principles and proceedings either with the word of God, the constitution of the church, or with justice and fair dealing.

Touching the whole case as now submitted to this Presbytery, as it relates to what has occurred in the Mt. Pleasant church and elsewhere, since the action of the April Presbytery of 1862, I have this to add in conclusion, that these difficulties were renewed in the congregation, while Mr. T. D. Urmston was in communication with members of this Presbytery who were counseling trouble in the Mt. Pleasant church, in the face of the action of a majority of an unusually large Presbytery, and before the pastor had an opportunity to read as ordered said action to his congregation; and under counsel and advice Mr. Urmston and the Presbyteries of Sept. 10th and 25th, have aggravated them; while a different course on the part of Mr. T. D. Urmston, his advisers and abettors, would have saved the church and its pastor many troubles in these sad times, and the interests

of our Master, and of his kingdom been more effectually promoted, amid the abounding desolation and apostasy, which these times record."

GEORGE MORRISON.

H.—*Statement of Rev. F. G. Strahan.*

Mr. Morrison, in his replication to the petition of the Mount Pleasant church for a dissolution of the pastoral relation, has referred to me in such a form as makes it proper that I should state the facts in the premises. (See page 12 of replication.) At a meeting of Presbytery at Versailles, in September, 1862, the elders present there, Messrs. Urmston and Wornell, urged me to come down and preach for them at an early day. I finally consented to do so, and accordingly preached in that church on the last Sabbath of September, and by the request of the elders gave notice of congregational meeting ordered by Presbytery. This is the only time I occupied that pulpit in several years. At the same time Major Kimbrough, elder of the church at Cynthiana, was present, and requested me to preach for them at an early day. I positively declined to do so. He expressed very great desire, too, that I should do so. I again declined. He then stated that he had received a letter from Mr. Morrison a few days previous, stating that he could not say when he would return home, urging him to get some one to preach for them occasionally and do the best they could till his return. I replied, that being the case I would preach for them, and did so on the first Sabbath in October, and at no other time, although earnestly solicited to do so. While in Paris at the meeting of Synod I was again earnestly desired to preach at the Mount Pleasant church. I declined doing so, stating that no doubt Mr. Morrison would return home in a short time and would fill his own pulpit. Mr. Morrison says in his replication that "an appointment was made for him (the Rev. F. Strahan) at the Mt. Pleasant church on Sabbath, October 27th." The fact in the case is that I had no appointment at the Mt. Pleasant church, and Mr. Morrison had knowledge of this fact in my own hand-writing of earlier date than the Sabbath referred to. Thus much I have felt it proper to state in order that the statements of Mr. Morrison may be properly understood so far as I am concerned.

Nicholasville, Ky., April 16, 1863.

(Signed,)

F. G. STRAHAN.

True copy, J. K. LYLE, Stated Clerk.

The above replication was filed with the Presbytery at Nicholasville on the 15th day of April. Having been prostrated upon a bed of illness, in consequence of exposure in attending upon this meeting of the Presbytery, the pastor was unable to attend the sessions of said Presbytery after the second day. On the third day of its sittings the Presbytery took up this case, and, upon a motion which was carried, the pastor was cited to appear at the next meeting to show cause why the pastoral relation should not be dissolved. Such a motion upon such a case, which gave a complete triumph to the projects of the disloyal faction in the Mt. Pleasant church, was resisted by Dr. Breckinridge and others. The ayes and nays being called, the following persons voted against the citation: *ministers*—R. J.

Breckinridge, S. Yerkes, Bayless, Lyle, Henry, and elder G. W. Lewis. May 5th, 1863, during the sessions of Synod the Presbytery of West Lexington was again constituted according to adjournment. The pastor still in feeble health, was present at this meeting, though no citation had been served upon him, as was contemplated in the action of the Presbytery taken at Nicholasville some two weeks before. Had such citation been served the course of the pastor was marked out. The following paper was prepared and in his possession, to be submitted to the Presbytery, as an answer to said citation, and as containing such of the *grounds* and *reasons* for an appeal to a higher court, as the action of the Presbytery at Nicholasville upon the case had made necessary; provided this Presbytery at Paris upon its own motion or upon this answer to said citation failed to do what was satisfactory to the pastor and to those who were struggling with him for the triumph of principles so important to the church. But the Presbytery, having failed to cite the pastor, this answer was not submitted. Upon the failure of the Presbytery to follow in respect to the citation, the provisions of the Book, a new complication arose and the action of the Presbytery was such, that the pastor saw no reason to dissent from it. Paper I is herewith published as showing the views of the pastor at the time, in regard to the action of the Presbytery at Nicholasville in this case, even though the subsequent course of that body at Paris made it unnecessary for him formally to use the same. Paper K shows action of Presbytery. Thus by this action of May 5th are the projects of disturbers in the church, *disturbers* who under "various pretexts promote *discontent*, *disloyalty* and *general alienation*, tending to the unsettling of ministers, to local schism and to manifold trouble," defeated. Singular end this; and the more so, because no exception is taken to this action by persons heretofore so conspicuous in aiding those intent upon trouble. The conviction of the probable defeat of the rebel army at Chancellorsville by the Federal arms, which the earlier movements of Gen. Hooker seemed to warrant, no doubt, had much to do in bringing about the result reached and embodied in said action of Presbytery.

I.—*Proposed Answer to a Citation not served.*

"This Presbytery, at the close of its sessions at Nicholasville, on the 17th inst. (illness having prevented me from being present on that day), having cited me

to appear, at this meeting of the Presbytery, and show cause why the pastoral relation between myself and the Mt. Pleasant church should not be dissolved, I would respectfully represent the following state of case, upon which the Presbytery must decide what further action it will take.

I.—(1.) The constitution of the church (Form of Gov., chap. xvii), prescribes the methods by which the very solemn relation between pastor and people is to be dissolved. These methods are specific, accordingly as the pastor or the people may desire the dissolution. In *both* cases, before the Presbytery, as requested by either party, can cite the other party, it must be advised of existing grievances. This is the law of the church, and is the practice of every well ordered court of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now the party, as appears from the action of this court, who have applied for a dissolution of the pastoral relation in this case, are *certain memorialists*, as seen vol. IX, pp. 106, 110, 114, 122, 123, 124, 128, 129, and 130 of your Records; and it is here represented by the pastor, the respondent in the case, that this Presbytery, in citing the pastor upon a case where no grievances are alleged in a regular way by the party requesting the dissolution, has done so in *violation* of the law of the church, and *thereby*, in such times as these and upon such a case as this, has established a dangerous *precedent*.

(2.) If the Presbytery, upon an irregular course of one of the *recognized parties* in the case, justify their action in departing from the Book, and in assuming *extraordinary powers*, in thus citing the pastor of the Mount Pleasant church upon a case where no *grievances* are regularly alleged, and that, too, upon a vote of twelve persons of a reasonably large congregation, such justification must be found in the *case itself*, as presented to them, or their decision is one either of *prejudice*, *mistake*, or *injustice*. Your respondent represents the case as he has already elsewhere substantially done, as *one* in which T. D. Urmston, as prime mover, with others, has disregarded the warnings of this Presbytery and of the Synod of Kentucky, in their action of 1861, against divisive courses: as *one*, in which T. D. Urmston and others have treated the order of this court of April 1862, upon this special case, and the warnings of the General Assembly of 1862, against proceedings tending to discontent, disloyalty, and alienation, with utter defiance; and the statement of facts made in *memorial* to Presbytery of September 10, 1862 (upon which has been predicated the subsequent action of Presbytery), signed by T. D. Urmston and others (a minority of the congregation), your respondent, as he has elsewhere substantially done, represents to be *absolutely* or *substantially* untrue.

Upon these grounds: (a.) Because the procedure is unconstitutional; and (b.) Because if powers are vested in the church by Christ, its head (which your respondent does not deny), to adjudicate cases submitted thereto, even though not in a regular method, the *case itself* that would justify such a departure from the written law of the church, must present an extraordinary state of facts; does your respondent, the pastor of the Mount Pleasant church, who thus represents the case of the Mount Pleasant church as not justifying a departure on the part of the Presbytery from the law of the church, and who further represents the *action* taken by the Presbytery after such departure, as not *justified* by the facts in the case, but the *reverse*, decline to unite with the minority of the congregation before this Presbytery, in asking for a dissolution of the pastoral relation between himself and the Mount Pleasant church.

II. The pastor, your respondent, feels called upon to state more in detail the

principles and reasons which have controlled and do control him in his action in the case.

If I had consulted my own feelings in the case, I would have asked Presbytery to dissolve my connection with this church at the spring meeting of this Presbytery of 1862. But in not allowing my judgment to yield to my inclinations in the case *then* and *subsequently*, I am now more thoroughly persuaded than ever that I have done my duty in my lot in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, as she is passing through the fiery ordeal of these times of defection from her, and disloyalty to her. To me it has been a trial to be pastor of a church where a *faction minority*, and two of these elders in the church, through the course of some fifteen months, have done so many things unkind and repulsive to me personally, and so injurious to the peace of the church and the cause of my Master. A greater trial still, has it been that when I failed to yield to the disloyal sentiment which that faction represented in the Mount Pleasant church and community, and thereby placed my life itself in jeopardy, while I have persisted in witnessing for Christ and his glory, I have received so little sympathy at the hands of my brethren in the Lord of this Presbytery.

But these trials and sufferings I am willing to endure, whatever may have been, or may be, the action of this Presbytery in the case at present, and among the *reasons* which prompt me to this course I mention the following.

(1.) The pastor is unwilling to see the control of the spiritual interests of the Mount Pleasant congregation pass by such methods as have been pursued in this church into the hands of a *faction* such as the one under question, until he has exhausted without success the methods of redress provided in the Book.

(2.) He is unwilling to see the church property itself pass into the control of a *faction* whose conduct has been so notorious in the county of Harrison that the constituted authorities of the land could not, without self-stultification, allow the Mount Pleasant church to be used as a place of assemblage for such persons as would congregate under the auspices of this faction.

(3.) He is unwilling to see, without his dissent, the loyal people of that community who contributed to the erection of the church building, deprived of a convenient place of worship; and if it be the mind of this Presbytery to surrender the secular and spiritual control of the Mount Pleasant church into the hands of this faction, he feels called upon to leave no method untried which will *avert*, if only for the present, from the loyal members of that congregation and people, the *surrender* of themselves to the control of a faction disloyal to God and country (a calamity against which this Presbytery in the bounds of a loyal state and among a loyal people should have protected them), or the *alternative*, to wit, a renunciation of their authority over them.

(4.) He is unwilling, finally, in consequence of his relation as a minister of Jesus Christ to the numerous loyal families in Harrison county, the field of his labors, to see, without his dissent, the moral power of *those* thus strengthened, whom he and the church of which he is a minister regards as guilty of *sin* and *immorality*, and against whom, in his lot, for the sake of truth, righteousness, and the honor of Christ, he is called to bear his witness, to the end of their return to country, duty, and God, and the salvation of their perishing souls.

With these views and for these reasons I, the pastor of the Mount Pleasant church, the party cited by this Presbytery, decline to unite in requesting a dissolution of the pastoral relation between myself and said church, and as a member of this court, steadfastly in my lot, resist the *encroachments* of disturbers in



the church, upon the honor and dignity of a church, which loyalty to Christ on the part of his ministry and servants exacts of us to watch, lest *she* may become *disloyal* to her Head and King, as so many of her wayward children have become.

May 4, 1863.

GEORGE MORRISON.

*K.—Action of Presbytery in this case at Paris, May 5, 1863.*

Regarding the whole matter of Mount Pleasant church in its relations to its pastor, Rev. George Morrison, in lieu of all its former action, the Presbytery adopts the following minute: Whereas, this matter has been before Presbytery for more than a year, and involves interests of vast importance, and in its present posture difficult questions, both as to the true state of facts and the interpretations of law applicable thereto; and hence it seems extremely difficult, if not impossible, to come to a conclusion entirely satisfactory to the mind of the Presbytery, as perfectly just and fair to all the parties concerned; and the Presbytery, regarding at the same time the interest and happiness of the pastor, the peace and prosperity of the church, and above all, the glory of the Master; therefore, Resolved, That all proceedings touching this matter, so far as they have been already initiated, be and they are hereby ordered to be stayed; and that all former action herein be and is hereby set aside, and shall be regarded and treated as of no force or effect. And further, that Mr. Morrison be earnestly recommended further prayerfully to inquire how he may best serve the cause of Christ in this matter; and the church also exhorted to make the matter a subject of serious meditation and prayer, in the hope that Providence may open up some peaceful solution of this unpleasant and deplorable difficulty.

This action is not intended, however, to interpose any obstacle to any regular and orderly proceedings which either of the parties may institute hereafter, in case they, or either of them, after due reflection and prayer, should desire a dissolution of said pastoral relation.

A true copy of paper B, adopted by Presbytery in session at Paris, Kentucky, May 5, 1863.

J. K. LYLE, S. C., W. Lex. Presbytery.

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS FROM MAY 5TH, 1863, UNTIL THE DISSOLUTION OF THE PASTORAL RELATION, NOVEMBER 17TH, 1863.**

The action of the Presbytery at Paris given above, so far as that tribunal was concerned, ought to have secured *peace* and *harmony* again in the congregation. But such were not the results desired by those disloyal agitators whom it was intended to effect. During the summer of 1863, the pastor preached at the Mt. Pleasant church at such times as his health and the condition of that part of Harrison county, infested by a band of guerrillas, would warrant. September, 1863, the West Lexington Presbytery, which met at Salem, the pastor being absent for reasons sustained by said Presbytery, again *reopened* the case, when neither the congregation nor the pastor had requested the same. Against this, serious opposition was made, but to no effect. The following persons composed this Presbytery: min-



*isters*, Forsyth, Simrall, Yerkes, Cheney, Browne, Brank, Lyle, Hays, Young and Scott; *elders*, Skinner, Vanmeter, Coulter, Wornell, Crooks, Dodd, Boyers, Taylor and Trimble. Of the persons so particularly zealous for this (*viz.*, the Rev. W. H. Forsyth and T. Wornell, *elder*, who sat without legal warrant), and of the circumstances under which done, the writer will here add nothing to what he formally has stated in his *complaint* and *appeal* to Synod of Oct. 14, 1863, against the *illegal* and *unjust* proceedings of the Presbytery which met in the Mt. Pleasant church on the first *Tuesday* of Oct. 1863, according to the resolution of adjournment, passed at Salem of September. This resolution is here given

*L.—Resolution of Presbytery at Salem, September, 1863.*

Presbytery having reason to believe that evils of a serious nature exist in the Mount Pleasant church. Resolved, that an adjourned meeting be held in said church on the first Tuesday of October, at 11 o'clock, A. M., for the purpose of enquiring into its state and redressing any evils that may be found to exist. And the stated clerk is directed to notify the pastor and congregation of this action.

A true copy.

WM. B. BROWNE, *Stated Clerk*.

October 6th, 1863, the Presbytery met in the bounds of the Mt. Pleasant congregation. Present: *ministers*, R. J. Breckinridge, W. H. Forsyth, W. B. Browne, R. J. Brank, J. K. Lyle, J. S. Hays, D. P. Young, Geo. Morrison, M. Vanlear and F. G. Strahan; *elders*, J. C. Skinner, J. B. Temple, G. Marshall, D. J. Dodd, Jacob Boyers, D. W. A. Walker, Vance Lemons and T. Wornell. Objection being raised by the pastor of the church, two of the elders present were not allowed to take their seats as members of the court; upon the grounds of their not having been appointed by their respective sessions. These elders were Vance Lemons and T. Wornell.

The disloyal faction of the congregation were present, expecting to have a congregational meeting. The character of these sixteen persons present, who appear to have been *ready* for the programme to be adopted, the pastor has described in his *complaint* and *appeal* to Synod. Those who were not posted and who were of a different mind from this faction, some of them having received no notice of said Presbyterial meeting; others wearied out, with the commotion and strife of this faction; some fearing the consequences, to their persons

and property, which a decided opposition would entail, were not present.

The resolution as given above, upon which the Presbytery had convened, having been read, the moderator, Rev. J. S. Hays, decided the proper course to be pursued in the investigation of evils, said by common fame to exist in the church, was as follows: "That the church be now called upon, *first the pastor*, and then the members of the church, to state whether they or either of them have any grievances, and if any, what? That the Presbytery then proceed to consider the case." We give the *opinion* of the moderator in his own words, inasmuch as such, forms an essential fact in the course of the proceedings of that Presbytery, as will appear in the sequel. We call it an *opinion*, and not a *decision*, for the reason, that there was no question of *form* at that time before the court, but one of *substance*, which it was not competent for the presiding officer of the court, but competent *only* for the *court* itself to decide. Considerable discussion here arose. The pastor did not concur with the moderator in his opinion as to the method of procedure, and at this early stage, *first* make *his* statement of grievances, and with such statement make the concession, afterward used in the manner it was by the Presbytery, as will be seen by a reference to *complaint* and *appeal*, section 3, under C of pastor, also section 6, of Breckinridge's *complaint*.

Pending such discussion, Elder J. B. Temple offered resolution (1), of paper M. The substitute (2) of Dr. Breckinridge, found in paper M, was rejected, by a vote of 12 to 4. Breckinridge, Lyle, Browne and Morrison voting for this, and the balance of the Presbytery voting against it. Thus, the Presbytery, if the right to come to that congregation under circumstances such as attended this case be ceded, deprived itself of the only legitimate way of "enquiring into its state, and of redressing any evils found to exist;" the purpose for which it had adjourned. The resolution of J. B. Temple was thereupon adopted. The Presbytery took a recess, and said so *called congregation* had a meeting on the afternoon of the 6th of Oct., the first day of the meeting of the Presbytery. The moderator of the Presbytery moderated said meeting, and the pastor attended it to see their proceedings.

On the morning of the 7th, the second day of the sessions

of Presbytery, the unfinished business was taken up. The moderator then presented in writing a report of the proceedings of the so-called congregational meeting over which he had been appointed to preside. Said report (3) will be found below in paper M. At the opening of Presbytery on the previous day there was no case before it for action. The pastor had declined being made a party to making a case, as was contemplated in the programme suggested by the moderator, early on the first day. In this emergency the *method* adopted is, instead of the pastor *first* making his statement and *then* the congregation, for the order to be reversed, and the so-called congregation *first* to do this. Thus matters had progressed on the second day towards making a case when there was none at the beginning, before the Presbytery. The pastor of the church had been deprived of his constitutional right to preside at a meeting of his congregation. A meeting had been held, and the report of it was now before the Presbytery. It is proper here to state that the paper submitted to this so-called congregational meeting and adopted as theirs, was drawn up by Elder J. B. Temple. Touching the contents of such paper, the pastor feels constrained to add, to what he has stated elsewhere in a paper (herewith published) submitted to Presbytery at that meeting, and also in his *complaint* and *appeal* to Synod, but this single remark—that, notwithstanding the emissaries and spies of this disloyal faction of the Mt. Pleasant congregation, upon various occasions and at different places in the county of Harrison and elsewhere, had watched and taken notes of their pastor's career, yet not one syllable, upon this occasion used to traduce him, can be alleged against his moral character. Touching the substance of the report of the Rev. J. S. Hays, and of his proceedings as moderator of so-called congregational meeting, the pastor has one or two remarks here to add to what he has said in his *complaint* and *appeal*, and to what has been said by Dr. Breckinridge in his *complaint*. These are: *First*, that the pastor of the church was *present* in the house inspecting the proceedings, when Mr. Hays sought information from one of the disloyal faction of the church as to what the custom of the congregation was in regard to voting. The pastor was ignored as a party, having no rights or privileges *there*; and *secondly*, that of the persons embraced in

one form or another in this report, *one* of them was a refugee from Price's rebel army of Missouri, a *second* one had taken his letter from that church to the Cynthiana church, and a *third* one would not in any form recognize such meeting as the congregation. These persons here described are not among those so minutely described in section 4 of the pastor's *appeal*.

So soon as the moderator had presented his report on the morning of the second day, as above alluded to, a resolution (4 of paper M) was passed, *requesting* the pastor at this stage to state any evils known to him to exist. This he did, and the substance of said statement, then verbally made, was at a later stage of the proceedings of the Presbytery reduced to writing and filed. At this point the Presbytery passed a minute expressing the full conviction that the pastoral relation should be dissolved; and this, too, when that question was not legally before the body. While the paper, the preamble of which had thus been voted on and passed, was pending, this amendment was offered: "*Resolved*, That the members of this church who absented themselves from the ministrations of their pastor, erred in so doing, and are censurable for such conduct, and that the church is morally and legally bound for the full amount of his salary to the time of his resigning of his pastorate." This amendment censured those who had refused to attend worship, those who had treated with contumacy previous orders of the Presbytery, and those who had not for more than a year paid anything toward the support of their church or the gospel; the same parties as are recognized in said so-called congregational meeting by the moderator, as the *congregation*, and it was ruled out of order by the moderator of the Presbytery. The decision of the moderator elicited by this amendment, declared that the petition of a portion of the congregation to have the pastoral relation dissolved, was not and had not been in the legal possession of the body. From this decision an appeal was taken, and the Presbytery sustained such decision and refused to allow the amendment or the decision and appeal to be recorded. It was true that neither the petition of a portion of the congregation nor the statement of the pastor, was in the legal possession of the house at the time of the passage of the minute above referred to, expressive of the conviction that the relation should be dissolved; but the moderator seemed not to have dis-

covered this until this vote of censure upon this faction of the church, is introduced. The paper above alluded to, a part of which was passed by the Presbytery, will be found in paper M, under (5).

In the dilemma a resolution was offered by Elder J. B. Temple "that the written report of the proceedings of the congregational meeting ordered be received and placed on file, and that Mr. Morrison have leave to file his statement in writing." This action ended the work of the Presbytery on that day, the 7th of October and the second day of the sessions.

On the morning of the 8th, Elder John B. Temple introduced the following resolution, which was carried, by the following vote: "*Resolved*, That in order to redress the evils found to exist in the Mt. Pleasant church, the pastoral relation existing between the Rev. George Morrison and the congregation of said church, which has been admitted by both parties to be neither desirable or profitable any longer, be and the same is hereby dissolved, and the church declared vacant." Vote for said resolution: *ministers*, Forsyth, Strahan, Vanlear, Young, Hays, Brank; *elders*, J. C. Skinner, David Coulter, J. B. Temple, G. Marshall, D. J. Dodd, Jacob Boyers, W. A. Walker. Against such: Breckinridge, Lyle, Browne and Morrison. Dr. Breckinridge gave notice of protest, complaint and appeal, with regard to the proceedings of Presbytery in this case, which were admitted to record. The pastor gave a similar notice, and lodged said complaint and appeal in the hands of the moderator of Presbytery on the 15th day of October, 1863. The *statement* of the pastor *requested* by Presbytery in a resolution of the second day, and at this stage reduced to writing, was now placed on file and is here published in paper N.

It is proper here also to state that Elder J. B. Temple and Rev. J. S. Hays were appointed by Presbytery to answer the *complaint* and *protest* of Dr. Breckinridge, filed with said body before its adjournment on the 8th of October, and the last day of its sittings in the Mt. Pleasant church. These gentlemen prepared such answer, and although said paper (because of its not having been placed in the custody of either the Presbytery or of the Synod until the case had been adjudicated by the Synod on the 19th of October, 1863), formed no part of the record in the case, still no opposition was made by the minority

of Presbytery to such paper being spread upon the minutes of said Presbytery. The *complaint*, etc., of Dr. Breckinridge, and the *complaint* and *appeal* of the pastor, is herein published in papers O and P. Before he passes to the next stage of this case, the pastor deems it necessary to make but one or two remarks additional, to what he has stated in his *appeal* and *complaint*, touching the grounds alleged in the resolution passed by this Presbytery, dissolving the pastoral relation; grounds alleged as reasons, for an act of the Presbytery so utterly subversive of law, of justice and of kind dealing toward the pastor, as this resolution embodies. 1. These were proceedings which gave complete triumph to a factious disloyal element in the Mt. Pleasant church; proceedings which established a precedent in our church courts that would encourage every faction of a similar character, whether in the minority or majority, in all of our churches in the border states, to inaugurate measures to get rid of loyal ministers; and therefore must be resisted and set aside if there were any justice in those who should constitute the higher courts. 2. As it had been his painful duty to resist these disloyal disturbers of that congregation, so it now became none the less sternly his duty to resist and have set aside the acts of the Presbytery, which had given triumph to such a faction.

Again, touching the contents of the paper of congregation, alleged as evils under (3) of paper M, and recognized by the Presbytery as evidence in their action of October 8, 1863, the pastor, (1) in his verbal statement before Presbytery, in his written statement marked N, and in his *complaint* and *appeal* lodged with Presbytery, all before this case was adjudicated, has alleged (and these allegations are undenied) that of such statements, some of them were absolutely *untrue*, some of them *frivolous*, and the balance were *perversions* of the truth or *misrepresentations* of it; and (2) That the evils which the pastor alleged, and which said same Presbytery recognized as evidence, but refused to investigate, were charges of a most serious character against the morality, piety and loyalty of the disturbers of the church in the bosom of a congregation, two of whose elders had defected, and from which congregation, the pastor desired to be released, so soon as the way could be made open.



*M.—Resolutions and Reports.*

1.—*Offered by Elder J. B. Temple.* "Resolved, That the Presbytery do now take a recess for so long a time as may be necessary to give the congregation of the Mt. Pleasant church an opportunity to present a statement of the evils, if any existing in said congregation, in proper form for the action of Presbytery, and that the moderator of Presbytery moderate said meeting."

2.—*Substitute offered by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge.* "Resolved, That all persons claiming to be members of Mt. Pleasant church are hereby directed to present themselves at the bar of this Presbytery to be examined before this body touching the matter into which the Presbytery had met to inquire."

3.—*Report of Rev. J. S. Hays.*—The Mt. Pleasant church in accordance with the direction of Presbytery was called to order by the moderator appointed for the purpose, and opened with prayer. Before proceeding to business, the moderator, upon being informed that the invariable custom of this church was to have the members of the church alone vote in such meeting concerning the pastoral relation, decided that the persons entitled to vote were all church members who, on the records of the church, are in good and regular standing, and against whom no charges have been preferred. He then asked for *any grievances* of any character whatever that the congregation might desire to present to Presbytery, upon which the following paper was presented of congregation.

*Paper of Congregation.*—At a meeting of the Mt. Pleasant church, convened in the house of worship of the said congregation, by order of the Presbytery of West Lexington to which said church belongs, the congregation respectfully beg to represent to the said Presbytery that they desire and respectfully petition that the pastoral relation existing between them and the Rev. George Morrison be dissolved, and they state the following as the grounds of the grievances upon which they base this petition, viz: The Rev. Mr. Morrison was not at the time he was called to the pastoral charge of this congregation its first choice, but as an act of concession to the wishes of the Cynthiana church, with which they had agreed to unite in the support of a minister to preach both to them and to us, the call was given in the hope that he might prove acceptable and useful in their midst. In this they have been disappointed, and he has become so unacceptable that a large proportion of the people, who have usually attended divine service in the Mt. Pleasant church, have ceased to attend.

He has refused to convene the session of the church when requested so to do, upon frivolous pretexts, and when notified that business of importance was to be transacted; that his bearing to elders of the church has been harsh and discourteous; that on account of dissatisfaction among the people, and by the death of one contributor, it is no longer possible to raise the amount of the salary promised by the congregation; that he has invoked the interposition of the military authorities of the country, and by military power taken from the proper keepers the records of the church, together with papers relating to its business and history, and he still holds them, as also the keys of the church; that the session has not been convened to present the letter of a member dismissed from another congregation, who had requested him to present this letter for admission to this church; that he refused to call a meeting of the congregation to consider the matter



of a dissolution of the pastoral relation when requested to do so, and that finally, from these causes and from the course pursued by their pastor in representing erroneously that disaffection has grown *entirely* out of differences in regard to the exciting political questions of the day, his usefulness in the congregation is at an end.

A division of the vote on the *paper* being called for, it was taken and stood as follows: Item 1, yeas 14, one person stating her dissent; item 2, yeas 14; item 3, yeas 11; item 4, yeas 14; item 5, yeas 14; item 6, yeas 15; item 7, yeas 11; item 8, yeas 13.

The moderator then asked for the information of Presbytery the names of all persons who voted in this meeting, which were given, and is as follows:—Thomas Wornell, T. D. Urmston, Samuel Allison, James Gray, Mary Gray, Margaret Gray, Nannie Gray, Minerva Gray, Helen Kimbrough, Mary Allison, Sarah Allison, Margaret Millner, Rebecca Wornell, Marion Cooke, Leah Webster, and Patsy Nisbit. For the further information of Presbytery the moderator also asked for the number of church members present, which was found to be 19. The question was also asked how many additional persons were present, who, although not church members, contributed regularly to the support of the church and submitted to its discipline? It was stated that two persons were present who would be in the future. The following resolution was then presented and unanimously adopted: "*Resolved*, That the congregation of the Mt. Pleasant church have full confidence in, and are fully satisfied with the course of our elders Wornell and Urmston in regard to the difficulties between themselves and the church and their pastor, the Rev. Mr. Morrison."

The meeting then adjourned.

Attest: J. W. URMSTON, *Secretary*.

J. S. HAYS, *Moderator*.

4.—*Resolved*, "That the Rev. George Morrison be requested now to state any evils known to him to exist in the congregation of the Mt. Pleasant church in such manner as he prefers."

5.—(a) "The Presbytery having heard the grievances of both parties, the church and the pastor, in the case, without entering into any further

Part of paper  
voted on.

examination of the case, or undertaking to decide any of the questions at issue between them, believing that such a course would

not be productive of good, is yet satisfied that such is the state of things in the church, alienation so incurable between the pastor and the congregation, as renders the continuation of the pastoral relation no longer desirable, (b) Therefore, *Resolved*,

The pastor of the church be cited to appear at our next

Part to which amend-  
ment was offered.

meeting (Frankfort), to show reasons why the prayer of the church should not be granted and the pastoral relation

dissolved."

N.—*Statement of grievances of Rev. George Morrison, filed with Presbytery, October 8, 1863.*

The Presbytery by resolution having requested the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church to make known to them any evils existing in said church of which he has cause to complain, he would respectfully submit the following paper, as embodying briefly some of the grievances under which he is suffering.

This Presbytery, at its meeting in Paris of May 5, 1863, having placed the case of the Mt. Pleasant church, which had then been before them for a year, in a pos-

ture where both pastor and congregation (in case difficulties could not otherwise be adjusted), could in a regular way come to this court for redress, and said case having been reopened by the Presbytery determining to visit said church upon representations made by one of the disaffected elders of the church at Salem, who sat in said court without legal warrant; and this having been done before the pastor (partly because of ill-health) could ascertain what his duties were in the case; he represents that through a period now extending over eighteen months a series of evils have existed in the bounds of said congregation, caused by a disaffected minority. Among these evils are:

(1.) The fact that one of the elders, Mr. T. D. Urmston, required of me to sign a written release presented to me in February, 1862, which paper required of me to certify as true, a state of facts which I had no knowledge were true, and which subsequent events have shown to be untrue, and required of me to do that which would have made me liable to censure by this court if I had so done; and then he and others made my refusal to do this, a ground of disaffection in the church.

(2.) The contumacy with which the order of the Presbytery of April, 1862, in this case, an order censuring two of the elders, Messrs. T. D. Urmston and T. Wornell, and enjoining upon them and upon the members of the church peace among themselves, was treated by this disaffected minority, who are now before this court by petition and complaint, in circulating and signing a paper whose end was trouble, the existence of which paper was kept from the knowledge of the pastor until about the 25th of May, 1862; further:

(3.) The utter defiance with which said order, which was in full force, was treated by these parties from October 27th, 1862, after they instituted further proceedings in and out of the Presbytery, while Kentucky was occupied by the Confederate army, and their pastor known by them to be within the Federal lines and treated by them as if dead; in seceding from the church; in taking the keys and records of the church with them, and holding the same; in absenting themselves from October 27th until now from the ordinances of God's house as administered by the pastor, and in their utter disregard of vows and obligations.

(4.) The persistent efforts by which these troubles have been crystalized and agitated in the congregation by this factious minority, by renewing and pressing in one form or another these troubles (which themselves had produced), to the discomfort of the pastor and the discomfort of the church, in papers submitted at various times to this Presbytery and otherwise, and in one now submitted to this meeting of Presbytery in the form of grievances, and a petition; the substance of which former papers I have elsewhere alleged to be substantially untrue; the substance of this paper now submitted, embodying personal reflections prejudicial to the pastor, and statements substantially untrue: are steps prompted by factious disturbers in the church, the direct result of which is (unless rebuked) disloyalty, alienation, schism and impiety in this church.

Under this state of facts the pastor desires Presbytery to institute such proceedings in the case that the pastor may see his way clear, as he long has desired to ask for the dissolution of the pastoral relation between himself and this people.

O.—*Dr. Breckinridge's Paper.*

The proceedings of this Presbytery (West Lexington) are excepted to, protested against, complained of and appealed from, in the matter of the visitation of the Mt. Pleasant church by said Presbytery.

(1.) That the refusal of the Presbytery to call before them those claiming to be members of the Mt. Pleasant church to give testimony and inform the Presbytery of actual evils, if any existed in the congregation, deprived the Presbytery of the natural and only effective method of being properly enlightened upon the very matters the Presbytery came to Mount Pleasant to investigate, and the adoption by the Presbytery of the order for the meeting of the congregation of Mount Pleasant church to be constituted under the moderator of the Presbytery, instead of the pastor of the church, in order to obtain a general statement, was unwise and illegal and calculated to organize disaffection, instead of procuring evidence or aiding Presbytery in healing difficulties or redressing evils.

(2.) That the mode of conducting said so-called congregational meeting, and the nature of that meeting, were of that kind that made it perfectly evident that said meeting was not the congregation, but only that portion of it which had for more than a year previous, absented themselves from all divine worship in the Mt. Pleasant church; who, during the same time, contributed nothing to the support of the pastor or the proper expenses of the congregation, and had, by the two ruling elders (Urmston and Wornell) who were acting with them, notified the pastor more than a year before, that they would neither attend public worship nor contribute to his support. In point of fact, not a single person of them (ranging from eleven to fifteen votes) was in such a sense a member of the Mount Pleasant church as to be a legal elector of a pastor or a legal voter in asking for a dissolution of the pastoral relation.

(3.) That the refusal of the Presbytery through the act of its moderator, sitting by its order as moderator of the said factious and seceded minority calling itself the Mount Pleasant congregation, to permit any one to vote but members of the church, and to allow all claiming to be such to vote, is illegal and contrary to the express decision of the General Assembly; for the stated contributors are entitled to vote even by the decision of the Assembly, where there is no distinct rule and practice to the contrary, and there is no good evidence that any such contrary rule or practice exists in this congregation. On the other hand it is notorious and undenied that the persons here persistently called the church and the congregation by the Presbytery, have so refused for a long course of time to give proper evidence of being entitled to vote for a pastor or for his removal; that they have escaped the possibility of discipline by the rebellious conduct of their leading coöperators, Ruling Elders Urmston and Wornell, in breaking up the church session. Moreover these persons thus treated and named as the congregation, the church, etc., are not only wholly disqualified as above shown, but the records of this congregation and of the Presbytery, and of the General Assembly, show that they are a clear minority of this church, being as 15 to 39, independently of stated contributors ruled out in all these proceedings.

(4.) That the attempt of the said factious minority to use a visitation of the Presbytery, to traduce and insult their pastor, and force a dissolution which they had failed in obtaining after a year of incessant agitation in and out of Presbytery to bring about, ought to be censured instead of approved, even indirectly, and it is unwise and illegal in itself and cruel to Pastor Morrison for the Presbytery to countenance or allow of such doing, under supposition that the dissolution of a pastoral relation can be effected by means of visitatorial proceedings in this way.

(5.) That the Presbytery erred and decided illegally and injuriously by pass-

ing a minute expressing the full conviction that the pastoral relation should be dissolved, not only without that question being legally before the Presbytery, but when the moderator had decided that the petition of a portion of the congregation to have that relation dissolved was not and had not been legally in possession of this body. Moreover, while the said resolution above alluded to was depending before Presbytery, an amendment was offered to it, declaring that the Mount Pleasant congregation was bound to pay the salary of the pastor, which has been withheld for a year, and that they who had refused to attend worship acted improperly, which amendment the moderator decided to be out of order, and the Presbytery on appeal sustained his decision, and then the body refused to allow the said amendment or the decision and appeal to be recorded: The whole of which proceedings taken altogether are unfair and unjust to the pastor, and without legal warrant.

(6.) After this the next step taken was the resolution offered by Elder J. B. Temple, and adopted by Presbytery, dissolving the pastoral relation between the Rev. George Morrison and the Mt. Pleasant church and declaring the church to be vacant, which action of the Presbytery under the circumstances in which it is taken, is illegal, unconstitutional, injurious to the congregation, subversive of the principles of morality and all church peace and order, and gives complete triumph, if it is sustained, to a factious minority, which has kept this congregation in trouble for a long course of time. The allegation of the Presbytery, as a chief ground of its action of the alleged virtual consent of Mr. Morrison to propositions drawing after them this action, is an act of which due respect to the Presbytery forbids the undersigned from saying more than that it is a great perversion of the real state of the case.

(7.) The undersigned offers the foregoing paper as a protest against certain proceedings of this Presbytery in the matter of the Rev. George Morrison and the Mount Pleasant church, and as the reasons of complaint and appeal to the Synod of Kentucky, if the Presbytery shall have the proper records before that tribunal at its next session, and if not, then to the General Assembly.

Mount Pleasant, Oct. 8, 1863.

ROB. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

*P.—Complaint and Appeal of Rev. George Morrison.*

*Appeal and Complaint in the case of proceedings of the West Lexington Presbytery, touching the Mount Pleasant Congregation.*

1. Your appellant the pastor represents the following state of case in the Mt. Pleasant congregation. In February, 1862, a release from obligations for salary in the call, written by Mr. Thomas D. Urnston, one of the elders, was handed to me by him, with the request that I should sign the same. This I declined, for the reasons, that he required me to certify as true a state of facts which I had no knowledge were true, and which subsequent events have shown to be untrue, and required me to do that which would have made me liable to censure by my Presbytery if I had so done. Such refusal he and others made the pretended ground of an organized disaffection in the church. The order of the Presbytery of April, 1862, which passed censure upon the parties implicated, to wit: two of the elders and a few of the members of the church, so soon as the case, in a regular way, was brought to the knowledge of the Presbytery, was treated with contumacy and defiance, by this factious minority, and instead of said disaffected party regarding the warnings of the Presbytery in this special case,

and of the Synod in 1861, against divisive courses, and the injunctions of the Assembly, they persistently prosecuted a course whose end was aggravated trouble. Their conduct in absenting themselves from the house of God from Oct. 27th, 1862, and the ministrations of their pastor until now; in disregarding their vows and obligations, in seceding from the church, and in taking the keys and records with them, upon the expulsion of the Confederate army from the state in October, and this too while the pastoral relation remained undisturbed by any motion of the pastor, or any action of the Presbytery, was that which tended only to the discomfort of the pastor and of the people, and were only successive steps prompted by factious disturbers in the church, the direct result of which (unless rebuked) is *disloyalty, alienations, schism, and impiety*, in the church.

2. Your appellant further represents, that proceedings were renewed in the congregation, in September, 1862, and pressed at several meetings of the West Lexington Presbytery, which sat within the Confederate lines, when the pastor was driven from his home, because loyal to his Government, in the progress of which proceedings the pastor had been treated as if dead; all of which said proceedings this same Presbytery cancelled and set aside in May, 1863, at Paris, and the posture of the case was thereby such that either pastor or congregation in a regular way, provided difficulties could not otherwise be adjusted, could come to the Presbytery for redress.

Upon the motion of a member of this Presbytery, who had been conspicuous in promoting these complications in the church, after representations in open Presbytery, from one of the disaffected elders, who sat without legal warrant in said Presbytery (the pastor being absent), the Presbytery at Salem, Sept., 1863, determined to reopen the case upon the following resolution: "Presbytery having reason to believe that evils of a serious nature exist in the Mount Pleasant church, *Resolved*, that an adjourned meeting be held in said church on the first Tuesday of October, at 11 o'clock, A. M., for the purpose of enquiring into its state and redressing any evils that may be found to exist, and the stated clerk is directed to notify the pastor and congregation of this action."

3. Your appellant, while he judges the above determination on the part of Presbytery to visit the Mount Pleasant church, under the circumstances, to have been unwise, does not deny but that the Presbytery has the clear right under the powers vested in her by the King and Head of the church, of visitation for the purpose of enquiring into the state of congregations in their bounds, and redressing in a regular way any evils that may have arisen (chapter x, section viii, of Form Gov.) But when the Presbytery had convened for this purpose, as alleged in the above resolution, and the pastor requested the Presbytery to institute such proceedings in the case as that he might see his way clear (as he has long desired) to request the dissolution of the pastoral relation, and when said Presbytery by a vote of 12 against 4 had decided that they would not cite persons claiming to be members of the Mount Pleasant church to appear before the court to be by them examined touching the very matters about which the Presbytery had met to enquire, and then without such an investigation, by resolution, declare the pastoral relation dissolved and the church vacated; your appellant, the pastor, can not but see in such action the ends of justice defeated, and from said action he feels constrained to appeal to this court of Jesus Christ for redress, and for these reasons:

(A.) *Such decision is contrary to the express provisions of the Book.* The Form of Government of this church, provides by special enactment, chapter xvii, for

the dissolution of the pastoral relation. Upon a statement of grievances from the pastor, who may desire to resign, which may commend itself to the mind of the Presbytery, the Presbytery can cite at its *next meeting*, the congregation to appear, to show cause why such relation should not be dissolved, and so in case of congregations desiring this (*mutatis mutandis*), a similar process must be pursued. In either case the other party must be cited at the *next meeting*. Now even though it be assumed that the Presbytery found evils to exist, as is alleged in the resolution passed by the Presbytery dissolving the relation, when they had refused to enquire if such evils existed, the action itself is *illegal*, in that the Presbytery then and there declared such relation dissolved, an act in which that body transcended its power, and did that which was directly contrary to the express provisions of the Book.

(B.) *Upon the mode of procedure adopted in the case it was incompetent for the court to adjudge evils as existing; and the method of redress adopted upon a contrary assumption, should have been a method not prejudicial to the pastor, even by indirection as in the resolution passed, but should have been prejudicial to the factious minority of the congregation.*

The Presbytery is a court of the Lord Jesus Christ. It had convened there for the purpose avowed in the resolution under which it had adjourned, to wit: as a court of *inquiry and redress*. It was competent for said court to take testimony in the case. This it refused to do. It was not competent after such a refusal to adjudge a case as if such testimony had been taken. But if the competency of the court be *admitted*, as is assumed in the resolution passed and excepted to, then your appellant alleges that such court, even upon the character of the evidence before them, should have adjudged a method of redress involving censure upon persons claiming membership in the church, who had absented themselves for more than a year (and which had not been denied), from the ministrations of their pastor, and who had, moreover, broken their vows and obligations both moral and pecuniary, rather than a *method* which even indirectly approves of such rebellious conduct of church officers and church members.

(C.) *The improper use made in the act of Presbytery of a concession of the pastor, and such concession in the resolution passed being made a ground for such action.*

Because of the original hostility against me, because loyal to my country, it has long been my desire, so soon as I could see my way clear, to resign the pastoral charge of this church. But one of the great obstacles in my way of this—an obstacle which involved a grave question of duty with me as a teacher of divine morality—was whether I could consistently surrender the secular and spiritual control of this church, and of the loyal persons who worship there, into the hands of a rebellious and disloyal faction. In a written statement of grievances submitted to the Presbytery, and also in a verbal statement made in open Presbytery, growing out of a proposition made to me by the moderator of the Presbytery, who, also, moderated the so-called congregational meeting—a proposition which carried with it on the part of those for whom made a result very different from the one announced in the resolution, I stated what I here repeat, that I was prepared and anxious to resign so soon as the Presbytery would make the way clear. Certainly it did not make the way clear for me to resign, for the Presbytery to make use of such concession in the form in which it appears in this resolution, and upon this as one of the alleged grounds to take an action, which action carries with it the complete triumph of this faction of the church—who now for more than eighteen months have kept the church in trouble—instead of their *deserved censure*.

4. Your appellant and complainant would moreover petition to this court, not



only a reversal of the final action of the Presbytery, but also a reversal of other and all actions of same court in this case, by which grievous injustice has been done to the pastor and the laws of the church thereby subverted. In the early part of the proceedings it was resolved by Presbytery to take a recess, that the congregation might have an opportunity to meet and present a statement of the evils, if any, in proper form to Presbytery, and the moderator appointed to preside. This procedure was illegal, arbitrary and unkind to the pastor. The modes prescribed by the Book, under which a congregational meeting can be held in a church, where there is a pastor, are three: (1) Such meeting can be held as called by the session, of whom the pastor is the moderator; (2) It can be held and presided over by such minister of the same Presbytery as the pastor, with the concurrence of his session may invite; (3) It must be held where a majority of those entitled to vote in such case shall petition so to be done. But neither of these is adopted. Among the powers of Presbytery, it can not be claimed as one which the Head of the church has vested in her, without charges against her ministers, one of His ascension gifts to his bride, the Church, thus to cut them off from the privileges and powers vested in them. When the Book provides a method by which all parties suffering grievances shall seek redress, that was a strange procedure of the court, which proceeds to take steps to make a case when there was no case before them, and a regular way by which the case could come if grounds for the same. After such meeting had been ordered, and the moderator ordered to preside, the proceedings of such meeting, when convened, were no less singular, unjust and illegal than what preceded. Of the persons composing this so-called congregational meeting, consisting, as reported, in all of 17 persons, *one* in the early stage of the meeting left the room, publicly stating, as she rose, that she was for Mr. M. but would go home. Of the 16 remaining, *two* had not contributed to the support of the gospel nor attended divine worship in the house, so far as the pastor has knowledge, since he has had charge of the church. Of the remaining 14 but six of them have contributed anything to the support of the gospel at any time since the pastor has been settled among them. And of these six, three of them (two of whom were ruling elders, Urmston and Wornell), had notified me a year ago they would contribute nothing, and a fourth refused to contribute. Since October 27, 1862, the first Sabbath I occupied the pulpit after my return home and the expulsion of the Confederate army from Kentucky, none of these 16 persons have either attended church or contributed any thing, according to their obligations, to the support of the gospel. The persons at the meeting who were willing to take any part in its proceedings, exclusive of contributors, were as 16 to 39 of those reported as members of the church. Of the members of the church who were absent, all of whom, with perhaps one or two exceptions, were of a different mind in regard to our national troubles from this factious minority: Some of them received no notice of the meeting: others were wearied with the continuous commotion and strife of this active faction, or feared for their persons or property, the consequences of a decided opposition to the programme of these disloyal and factious disturbers of the church.

Now such was the nature of the proceedings of the Presbytery leading to this so-called congregational meeting, and such were the persons treated by the Presbytery as the congregation, when not one of the 16 was a member of the church in such a sense as to be a legal voter. This so-called congregation, composed mainly of disloyal disturbers and their accomplices, in a paper reported by the



moderator to the Presbytery, made said meeting the occasion of traducing their pastor; the statements of which paper your appellant represented to the Presbytery were absolutely or substantially untrue, and that he was prepared to furnish the proof to this effect, and yet the Presbytery, notwithstanding this, took action in the case, which action was based upon this paper as one of the chief grounds.

Your appellant and complainant states to this court that the statements and charges of such paper are statements and charges of a disloyal faction against a minister because loyal, some of which are *frivolous*, some of which are *untrue*, and the balance of which are *misrepresentations* or *perversions* of the truth, and he represents that the action of the Presbytery in the case, based upon such, is *illegal, unjust and unkind*, and should be reversed and the Presbytery censured.

Some of these charges in said paper I will enumerate: Charge A: "*That Mr. M., at the time of his call, was not the first choice of the congregation.*" The records show this to be untrue. Charge B: "*That I had become unacceptable,*" etc. To persons disloyal to their country, who are prepared to make their pastor's loyalty the ground of an organized hostility against him, I do not doubt but that a loyal minister is unacceptable. In violation of his ordination vows T. D. Urmston (elder), and his accomplices have been active in trying to effect this result.

Charge C: "*That he refused to convene the session when notified that business of importance was to be transacted.*" Since the meeting of the session of the Mt. Pleasant church on March 23, 1862, at which time the pastor discovered the conspiracy in the church, which has cost him so much trouble, when the session passed a minute of reference of the case to Presbytery, which minute was suppressed from the sessional book (Mr. Urmston acting as clerk), until the time of the defection of two members of his session from the church, but two calls for a sessional meeting were regularly made. In one case, that of April 7, 1862, the object of the meeting was not stated to the pastor, but he authorized notice to be served for such meeting to be held. In the other case, that of 25th of April, 1862, after the request was made, upon the motion of the same party who made the request (one of the two disaffected elders), it was recalled, when reasons as alleged for calling such meeting, were reasons which, upon evidence in my possession, any sane man would conclude were not the *real* ones. Charge D: "*That he has invoked the interposition of the military authorities.*" The leader of this disloyal faction, Mr. T. D. Urmston, seceded from the church with the expulsion of Bragg from the state in 1862. He took with him and held in his custody the keys and records of the church. Upon application by a note from the pastor for the records and record book, bearing date November 1, 1862, he refused to deliver them into the hands of those to whom they rightfully belonged. Said person holding both keys and records, and then defiantly insulting, and that too while he remained in the Federal lines, persons loyal to their country, who desired to worship in that church, application was made to the *Provost Marshal*, an officer created under an act of Congress and as much one of the constituted authorities of the land in time of war as civil officers are in time of peace—the person from whom redress for such outrages, as in this case, was to be sought, and by said officer, said keys and records were placed in the hands of those to whom they rightfully belonged.

So of the statements and charges in said paper, and so-called petition of the

so-called congregational meeting, not herein enumerated, I allege that they are either frivolous, or misrepresentations, or untrue, and are, mainly, with those enumerated, a recapitulation of what had been embodied in a petition from the same factious minority, upon which proceedings had been instituted in September, 1862, by the West Lexington Presbytery, while said Presbytery sat within the Confederate lines—proceedings which were afterwards cancelled by the same Presbytery in May, 1863.

Your *complainant* and *appellant* comes to this court upon this state of case and for the above reasons, for redress of grievances so grave as those involved in the irregular, illegal and unkind proceedings of the Presbytery of West Lexington in the case of the Mt. Pleasant church, and in this paper embodies the grounds and reasons for complaint and appeal to the Synod, if the Presbytery shall have the proper records before that body at its next meeting, and if not then to the General Assembly.

Geo. MORRISON.

Cynthiana, October 10, 1863.

On the 15th day of October, 1863, six days after the rising of the West Lexington Presbytery, which sat in the Mt. Pleasant congregation, the *complaint and appeal* of the pastor and that of Dr. Breckinridge were lodged in the hands of the clerk of the Synod and on the 19th day of the month, the 5th day of its session, the Synod, by a vote of 28 to 3, *reversed* and set aside the action of the Presbytery—*reinstated* the pastor—*made* the way *open* for him to carry out his *purpose*, made formally known to Synod and entertained for more than a year, of resigning the pastoral charge of the Mt. Pleasant church—*censured* those members of the church who had disregarded the ordinances of God's house and required them to perform obligations which they had renounced. The *method* by which the keys and records of the church are taken from the possession of the seceded and disloyal faction by the military and constituted authorities of the land (while the right to such keys and records, as claimed by the pastor in his appeal, is not questioned), is *disapproved*. The action of Synod in the case is given below in paper Q. The ten days not having expired, after the rising of Synod on the 19th, during which time an appeal might be taken from its decision by either the disloyal faction of the church or by the majority of the Presbytery, the pastor could do nothing more at the adjourned meeting of the Presbytery held in the Horeb Church, Fayette county, on the 21st of October, than what is embodied in paper R, from the records of the Presbytery. At the meeting of the Presbytery, adjourned to meet in Lexington, November 17, 1863, to dissolve the pastoral relation of the

Rev. J. K. Lyle, between himself and the Horeb church, requested by him because of disaffection in that congregation on account of his loyalty,—the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church carried out his long cherished purpose of asking for a dissolution of said relation. The action of the Presbytery is given below in paper S.

Thus ended this matter, and though no formal dissent was made to an irregularity of dissolving (at that meeting) the relation as requested by the pastor, instead of at the (next meeting) as required by the book, and for which similar act the Presbytery had been censured by the Synod, yet if the regular way had been pursued the pastor would have lodged with the Presbytery a paper, signed by the loyal members and supporters of the Mt. Pleasant church, vindicating his course and *disapprobating* the course of those who, for a period of eighteen months, promoted trouble, alienation and disloyalty in that church. But after the triumph of the principles which he had so sternly advocated in these sad times for so long a period, thereby incurring the displeasure of the disloyal among whom he lived, he did not feel that either the honor of his Master or the dignity of truth required further sacrifices at his hands, in the way of such further embarrassments as would follow upon a formal dissent from an act of the Presbytery which, though irregular, yet accomplished what he desired.

Q.—*Action of Synod.*

The appeal and complaint of Geo. Morrison and the complaint of R. J. Breckinridge, are so far sustained as to set aside the act of the Presbytery of West Lexington, dissolving the pastoral relation; but it appears from all these papers that the further continuance of the pastoral relation would be unprofitable. The Synod therefore enjoins on the congregation to pay Mr. Morrison the salary due him, and advises Mr. Morrison thereupon to carry out his purpose of voluntarily resigning the pastoral charge. The Synod further expresses its disapprobation of the course of those members of the Mt. Pleasant congregation, who have voluntarily absented themselves from the ordinances of God's house. The Synod also disapproves of the course of Mr. Morrison in invoking the interposition of the military authorities in order to obtain possession of the keys of the house of worship and the records of the session.

A true copy from the records of the Synod of Kentucky.

S. S. McRONKERS, *Stated Clerk.*

R.—*Extract from Records of Presbytery of 21st of October.*

A certified copy of the judgment of Synod being found in the hands of a member of Presbytery; therefore,

*Resolved*, That the certified copy of the judgment of Synod be ordered to record. Thereupon, Rev. Mr. Morrison expressed in open Presbytery his intention of complying with the judgment and advice of Synod, and at the same time he desired that the church, in good faith, comply with the judgment of Synod and perform the acts required of them by Synod; and that the stated clerk be requested to furnish the elders of the Mt. Pleasant church a certified copy of the judgment of Synod, and notify them that there will be a meeting of Presbytery on the third Tuesday in November, at 11 o'clock, A. M., in the first church, Lexington, at which time Presbytery hopes they will comply with their part of the obligation.

A true extract from the minutes of the West Lexington Presbytery.

WM. B. BROWNE, *Stated Clerk*.

*S.—Action of the Presbytery of November 17, 1863.*

The business of the Mt. Pleasant church was then taken up, upon the call of the pastor, and the following minute was adopted:

The church of Mt. Pleasant, through their committee to raise the pastor's salary, appeared in Presbytery and settled in full the salary due Rev. Geo. Morrison, according to the injunction of Synod. Whereupon Rev. G. Morrison, according to his purpose previously made known to Synod, voluntarily asked for a dissolution of his pastoral relation with said church.

On motion the request was granted and the Mt. Pleasant church declared vacant.

W. B. Browne was appointed to preach in the Mt. Pleasant church and declare it vacant.

A true copy from the minutes.

WM. B. BROWNE, *Stated Clerk*.

Passed November 17, 1863.

SOME SPECIAL REMARKS UPON THE ACTION OF THE SYNOD, AND  
SOME GENERAL REMARKS TOUCHING THE CASE.

It will be observed that the writer while he found in the action of the Synod as a whole, the redress and satisfaction which he sought and therefore made no formal dissent to any special point in said action; and while he has submitted to and carried out the will of the Synod in the case; yet with all deference to the decision of that tribunal, the pastor thinks the Synod *erred* when it *disapproved* of the method to which he resorted to recover to the use and custody of the proper keepers, the keys and records of that church; and to protect himself from lawless aggression. After this disloyal faction had seceded from the church, there was still a congregation left. Of this congregation, the writer was the pastor, in fact and in law. This congregation had a legal right to the use of that church, and a legal right to the custody of its keys. Said con-

gregation had also a legal right to the records which had been with the *keys* carried off by the seceded faction. There were several methods by which the question of who were the proper keepers of these *keys* and *records*, might have been determined. Here it is assumed that said right was with that part of the congregation and the pastor, who had not seceded. These methods were by means of: (1), spiritual tribunals, (2), civil tribunals, and (3) military tribunals. They resorted to violence, and were stopped.

It was competent for the Session, constituted of the pastor and the elder who had not defected (provided such elder would act), to have arraigned and suspended the two rebellious elders, one of whom held the keys and records; or equally competent for them to have *declared* under the circumstances, such suspended (*As. Minutes*, 1825, p. 255) from the church. It was competent for a higher court than the Session to have done this. But had either of these methods been pursued, and had the spiritual courts adjudged, as we have assumed they must, that said right was with that portion of the church which had not seceded, and ordered such keys and records to have been delivered into the hands of those to whom they rightfully belonged, there is every reason to believe that said order would have been treated by these *insurgents* of the church with the same contumacy, that previous orders of said spiritual courts had been treated. What would have been gained, then, by this process, in the way of securing to the pastor and congregation, their rights and privileges of worshiping in the Mount Pleasant church? To have recovered such keys and records from these *insurgents*, resort must have been made either to the civil tribunals or to the military tribunals, for an order for said keys and records to have been delivered over to their rightful keepers. But the delay incidental to a protracted litigation before the spiritual tribunals, and the further delay after such case had there been adjudged, incidental to a protracted litigation before the civil tribunals; with such keys and records still in the custody of the *insurgents*, would have defeated, practically, the very end in view, the *speedy* and *effectual* resistance of these disturbers and disorganizers. To prevent such delay, and to effect the desired results, resort was made to the *Provost Marshal* of this military district,

an officer as much the creature of the law as the judge or sheriff—an officer not only competent to do what was needed to be done, but one whose duty it was to see that such of the citizens of his district as were loyal to the Government should be protected in all their rights and privileges, and among these, by no means the least of assembling in their house of worship. It was his duty to see such protected against the outrages of the disloyal, whether such were out of the church or in it, and if they in defiance of law and order, so persistently manifested their rebellious conduct, it was the duty of that officer of the law, to see that they should be deprived of the means of doing this, and that those citizens who were loyal, whether in the church or out of it, should be protected and encouraged in their attempts of doing good, in the midst of a rebellious community. The Synod, could hardly mean that they who are prevented by violence from statedly worshiping God, should not seek protection in a lawful manner? May not the law suppress illegal violence?

Now it is this which is disapproved by the Synod in its action, to wit: "The course of Mr. Morrison in invoking the interposition of the military authorities in order to obtain possession of the keys and records of the session." The question as to who were the proper and legal keepers of these keys and records, the pastor here has not attempted to argue; he has assumed that they into whose hands they were placed by the constituted authorities of the land, for the use of that part of the congregation which had not seceded, and who remained loyal to the church and their country, were such proper and legal keepers. This right, claimed by the pastor at the bar of both the Presbytery and of the Synod, is not questioned, nor are the facts upon which claimed, denied by either tribunal. The writer has pointed out briefly the methods which might have been pursued, and he has shown what would probably have been the result of any other course than the one pursued. If the Synod therefore, either as a matter of policy or of expediency, decided as it did when it disapproved the course of the pastor touching said keys and records, then the Synod erred in not approving instead of disapproving a course which was one dictated by wisdom—with a purpose to prevent a breach of the peace—to conserve the interests of a loyal church and with



a view to defeating the projects of disloyal disturbers in her bosom. (Deliverance of Assembly, 1862, p. 625, sec. III.)

But there is an aspect of this question, in which, to the casual observer, it might appear that the Synod decided right in this behalf. The powers of the church are spiritual. Her government is a government by tribunals. Had the session or a higher court ordered these insurgents to have delivered such keys and records into the hands of their rightful keepers, and said insurgents refused to respect such order, there was no power of *force* in said courts to have them wrested out of their hands. For either of such courts to have exercised *such forcible power as a legal right*, or for either of them to have claimed as an inherent right and exercised it as such, the right to order either the civil or military authorities to have executed by force their orders, this would have been *Erastianism*. And if the case decided upon by the Synod had been one similar to the ones supposed, then would her decision as given, in this particular, also been right. But the case was not similar. If the rights of the pastor's property or person had been invaded—were a man or men threatening vengeance against the pastor's life, because loyal to his country, with a drawn deadly weapon, to place themselves at his door and allow him entrance and egress at their pleasure, no man would judge him guilty of any impropriety in seeking relief or redress from such of the authorities of the land, as was competent to give him the desired aid and protection. Were he upon his circuits, in the discharge of his ministerial duties in this county, whence so many men and so much aid has been given to the enemy, having discovered some conspiracy by which great personal harm should befall any loyal citizen, to request the interposition of the military authorities to prevent the same, no one would judge him as having done wrong. So in this case, if the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church, in his capacity as a *citizen*, upon his individual responsibility (and that too as a *citizen, whose oath of allegiance is upon file in the office of the county clerk, as required by the laws of this commonwealth, ere he can perform all of the duties pertaining to his ministerial office,*) asked the authorities of his country to protect the loyal members of that church and himself against the outrages of a disloyal faction, upon the case

presented to them; for so doing he wishes his brethren to *approve* rather than *disapprove* of such course.

One other remark, and the writer will conclude. The pastoral relation is a solemn one. Ere a minister assumes the pastoral charge of a people, he ought to see the hand of God in putting him there. It is none the less his imperative duty to see the same hand in taking him away. For eighteen months the pastor of the Mt. Pleasant church continued in said charge beyond what his own personal wishes would have dictated, and now that he believes he has seen the hand of God in the way of opening for his release, he asks his brethren and the people of God in candor to examine his course and to decide whether in his trusts, as a minister of Jesus Christ, as a member of society, and as a citizen, through much suffering and personal peril as this record shows, he has not been in these sad times faithful in his allegiance to his Master and to the "powers ordained by Him."

---

ART. VI.—*The Men of Danville.* No. 1.

IT is our purpose briefly, in two or three successive numbers, to give biographical sketches, partly from historical documents and partly from personal knowledge and recollections, of the eminent men who laid the foundations of, and aided in building up, the Presbyterian churches and the literary institutions of Danville. This record is due to them—will not be without interest to the present generation, and will be valued by those who come after us. Indeed, such a record can not but be of interest to our present readers; many of whom know little of those who have preceded in laying the foundations of institutions which, we trust, are destined, in the good providence of God, to exert a still greater and more useful and blessed influence on the generations to come. We shall not, however, begin at the beginning, but near the close, with the name of the man, who above any other has contributed to this work.

**A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE REV. JOHN C. YOUNG, D. D., LATE PRESIDENT OF CENTRE COLLEGE.** *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*, Vol. XVI.

The New American Cyclopaedia published by the Appletons, contains a short notice of Dr. Young, but wholly unworthy of that distinguished man. John Clarke Young, D. D., late President of Centre College, Danville, Ky., was born in Greencastle, Pennsylvania, August 12, 1803. He was the youngest of two sons of the Rev. John Young, minister and pastor of the Associate Reformed Church in that place, and of Mary (Clarke) Young, both probably of Scotch-Irish descent. Though his father died while yet quite a young man, he was an eminent preacher, and his biography will appear in a forthcoming volume devoted to the lives of the ministers of the denomination to which he belonged, from the graceful pen of Dr. Sprague; who has made the present age as well as posterity, so greatly his debtor by collecting, at such immense labor, and transmitting to the future, the names, the memories, and the deeds of so many good, and of some very great men, which would otherwise have perished in the ages; and which posterity will the more value, because these memoirs will give an insight into the interior of the past, which we in vain seek for in the lives merely of the intellectual giants who have overtopped all their contemporaries, and the shadow of whose fame alone ordinarily reaches beyond their own day.

Being a posthumous child, Mr. Young was brought up entirely under the direction of his mother, a wise and judicious woman; who lived to see her only surviving son rise to the highest position of usefulness and eminence, and for many years to enjoy the gratification. Dr. Young was another striking example of the fact, that eminent men, in great part, owe their mental and moral characteristics to their mothers, and have their influence largely impressed upon their lives. He was a most affectionate son, and cherished his widowed mother to a venerable age. She, together with his two widowed sisters, elder than he, resided with him many years. She died some eight or ten years before him—her last end being that which Balaam so passionately invoked for himself. Her last words addressed to her son were—

Goodness and mercy all my days  
Have surely followed me;  
And in God's house forevermore,  
My dwelling place shall be.

One of his sisters also died before him—the younger, Mrs. Jane Ramsey, since his death and recently. The writer seizes this opportunity to record the merits of a woman, who, though not coming under the caption of this article, was one of the *women* of Danville—who, in no mean degree, aided in building up through a generation, the churches and institutions of Danville, and richly deserve to be remembered by a grateful posterity. Amiable, intelligent, and active in every good work, she will be long and affectionately remembered by all who knew her.

Dr. Young obtained his classical education under Mr. John Borland, an eminent teacher in the city of New York—was three years a student in Columbia College in that city, and was graduated at Dickinson College, Pennsylvania, in 1823, under the presidency of Dr. John M. Mason. He had already united with the church by profession, and now determined to prepare himself for the ministry under the guidance and advice of Dr. Mason, of whom he had been a favorite from childhood; having declined the most tempting offers to enter the profession of the law under the auspices of his maternal uncle, Matthew St. Clair Clarke, Esq., at that time an eminent lawyer and politician, and for many years Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States. He was a tutor in the College of New Jersey, at Princeton, for one or two years, and simultaneously in the spring of 1824, entered the Theological Seminary there, in which he remained four terms. While at Princeton he was the contemporary and intimate friend of Drs. Hodge, Dod, and the two Alexanders, Addison and James, all then young men, and enjoyed the high opinion of Dr. Archibald Alexander as will be seen below; by whose advice he was guided in his course of life as long as that wise and venerable man lived. In the spring of 1827, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New York. After preaching in several eastern cities, where he was strongly solicited to settle, he visited Lexington, Ky., and was elected and installed, in 1828, pastor of the McChord Presbyterian Church in that city. In the fall of 1830, the presidency of Centre College became vacant by the resignation of Dr. Blackburn, and Dr. Young, then only enter-

ing his twenty-eighth year, was unanimously elected to that office by the Board of Trustees. Though so young, and having been in the state but a short time, he had already attained to the first rank as an able and eloquent preacher, and a man of varied and accomplished acquirements. His election was largely owing, however, to a letter written by Dr. Archibald Alexander to the Rev. James K. Burch, a member of the Board of Trustees. "If your inquiries," said Dr. Alexander, "relate to the president of a college, there is no man within my acquaintance better qualified for such a situation than John C. Young, who is already among you. It is a mistake to look out for old men if you can get young men who are qualified; the first must be going down, but the latter will be improving for a long time to come. You may depend upon it, that Young is a first rate man, of extensive acquirements, and of a pleasant but decisive temper."

For nearly twenty-seven years, and until his death, he amply and successfully fulfilled the expectations and promises of eminence and usefulness thus excited in his early youth. He entered the Institution when it was in a very low condition, and left it at his death, one of the most prominent schools of learning in the South-west. During his residence in Lexington, he married, Nov. 3d, 1829, Frances A. Breckinridge, the eldest daughter of Cabell Breckinridge, Esq., and grand-daughter, by her mother's side, of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Stanhope Smith; by whom he had four daughters, all now married, three of them to clergymen—two of them, we are grieved to say, residents of the rebel states, and now bitter sufferers in the wretchedness brought on by this mad, wicked and most atrocious rebellion. What would have been Dr. Young's course, had he unfortunately lived to see the sad days in which we survive, no one who knew him can for a moment doubt. But he seemed through all his life and in all its events and circumstances, to have been a special favorite of Heaven, and was graciously removed before these days of sadness, trial and temptation came, in which so many whom he loved have fallen—some to rise no more. His wife died in 1837; and in 1839 he was married the second time to Cornelia Crittenden, daughter of that late eminent patriot-statesman, John J. Crittenden; by whom he had six children, three sons and three daughters. The two oldest of his sons

were graduated in Centre College; and the first, having passed through a course of three years in the Danville Theological Seminary, is now preaching the gospel. The second is still a member of the Seminary. All of his children survived him and are still living. Few men have been so happy in their domestic relations—he was eminently kind and affectionate as a husband, and his two wives were models of every female excellence.

In 1834 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Kentucky, at its annual meeting held in Danville, passed some very decided resolutions favorable to the gradual emancipation of the slaves, and appointed a Committee to present and advocate their views before the public. A very able address from the Committee was published, written by Dr. Young, which attracted great attention at the time, and had an extensive circulation. It has been, more than once since, republished—very recently by the American Tract Society in connection with Wilberforce and Fox's speeches on the slave trade and other anti-slavery documents. These resolutions were gotten through the Synod by a large vote, chiefly obtained through the influence of Dr. Young and the late John Green, Esq. They could not perhaps have passed, had the body been meeting in any other community in Kentucky; and certainly not in the absence of these two gentlemen. This effort would, in all probability, have been eminently successful, had it not been for the violent agitation for the immediate, unconditional and reckless *abolition* of slavery which commenced soon after in the North, and has been continued with increasing virulence to the present day, culminating, in combination with the *fire-eating* pro-slaveryism of the South, both alike

More fell than tigers on the Libyan plain,

in the present condition of our unhappy country. These two demons, both sprung from the bottomless pit, have taken possession of portions, originally small, of our people in the two great divisions of our country, and have been permitted by an all-wise and all-gracious but inscrutable Providence to involve the whole land—to which five-sixths of the people in each division were utterly opposed—in a most bloody, most destructive, most suicidal civil war. Utter madness, raving insanity, has ruled the hour, and men born to be brothers have fallen to cutting each



other's throats, and destroying all that each held valuable; and, as a matter of course, the *persons*—over whom and about whom this deadly contest is waging (or, to use the fashionable and awkward solecism, "is being waged"), as every sane man foresaw would be the case,—every man whose mental vision was not put out by the fierce spirit of hate to the North, and the fiercer spirit of zeal for *liberty* based on *slavery*—are likely soon, between the two fierce contestants, to slip their shackles, and stand before the world free-men without the preparation necessary for freedom. The South will have lost all for the *possibly* contingent loss of which she madly rushed into civil war, and the North will have won the *elephant*, which it will hardly know what to do with when obtained. But "shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?" "I form the light and create darkness: I make peace and create evil: I the LORD do all these things." And out of "all these things"—all this dreadful "evil," we doubt not He will bring good—good, which in its abundance will make the evil to be forgotten to our children and to our children's children, if not to us. These reflections and this faith, if it will not bring back the *dead*, will at least comfort those who have suffered, and bled, and agonized, if they have souls large enough to comprehend and to realize them.

Dr. Young had subsequently an animated controversy with the Revs. Messrs. Steele and Crothers of Ohio on *abolitionism*, in which he set forth and vindicated the distinction between the anti-slavery views of the emancipationists of Kentucky and those of the abolitionists. The *spirit* that animates the two parties, at least the emancipationists and the extreme abolitionists of the Garrison and Wendell Phillips school, is the spirit of love and the spirit of hate; of good will towards the poor slave, and the desire, earnest and sincere, to do him good as fast and as effectively as it can be done, and as he is prepared to receive and enjoy it; it is the spirit of the gospel of Jesus, hearkening to the voice which said, "Do unto others as you would wish that they should do unto you." The other seems to be, as far as charity even can judge, not so much *love* to the slave as *hate* to the slaveholder. It is the gospel according to Jean Jacques Rousseau; it is the benevolence of infidelity; it is the humanity of Jacobinism.

Emancipation is practical, and favors the doing of what is right and *practicable*. Abolition is ideal, and runs the ploughshare of its theories through the actual and established institutions of society with reckless disregard of consequences. Emancipation would free the slave under circumstances favorable to his welfare and happiness, and endeavor to provide the requisites thereunto. Abolition seeks his freedom only, and leaves his welfare and happiness to take care of themselves. It says to him; "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled." It is faith without works. Emancipation is actuated by the spirit of Jesus and his disciples through all ages—that divine spirit which has patiently encountered the evils in the world, and perseveringly labored for their removal through good report and through evil, in season and out of season. Abolition is the spirit of modern philanthropy, radical, impatient, reckless, fanatical, impracticable. Emancipation is the spirit that inspired Washington, Franklin and Jefferson and the Fathers of the Revolution; and, more recently, the great Kentucky statesman, Henry Clay, who would have attended the emancipation convention, held in 1849 at Frankfort, but for the officious interference of some of his pro-slavery friends. Pro-slavery and abolition fanaticism are twin sisters of common parentage; Both, like ferocious beasts on either side, have aimed at the life of the nation. She bleeds at every pore, but will survive, we doubt not, and crush beneath her feet both monstrous births, *Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*.

Monsters, misshapen, horrible, immense,  
Bereft of Patriotism, Honor, Sense.

Among the persons who united with Dr. Young in promoting emancipation in Kentucky was Mr. James G. Birney. But Mr. Birney soon *progressed* into extreme abolitionism, and became subsequently the abolition candidate for the Presidency. He was a native of Danville, was a man of education and high intelligence, and a Christian gentleman, amiable, upright and honest, but wholly unreliable in his judgment where his feelings were concerned. He *progressed*, in a short period, from a pro-slavery colonizationist to an extreme abolitionist.

Dr. Young continued to be till his death, the temperate advocate of gradual emancipation. He twice emancipated the slaves owned by his wives with their consent, and aided others

in obtaining their freedom by purchase, *standing* for them, as the negroes call it, in several cases, sometimes at very great and long continued trouble to himself, if not pecuniary detriment. In 1849, when the question of calling a convention for revising the Constitution of the state was discussed before the people, the emancipation question entered largely into the discussion. Dr. Young engaged boldly and ardently in public debate with two able men, the Hon. John Kincaid, of Danville, and President Shannon, of Bacon College, Harrodsburg, in support of inserting a clause in the new Constitution favorable to emancipation. He preached to his congregation, and published by request, in 1846, a sermon on the "Duties of Masters to Servants," which has been since, more than once, republished, and will no doubt continue to be republished as long as this unfortunate relation shall exist in this country. In 1831 or 32 he had delivered an able address before the Kentucky Colonization Society, which was published by the society. He promoted the instruction, moral, religious and *literary* of the slaves in the congregation to which he preached in Danville, which was mostly slaveholding; and through a long period he promoted their welfare in every possible way, in a wise, practical and temperate manner. A colored Sabbath school was maintained in the church for many years, and there is perhaps no part of the slave states where the slave population is so far advanced in intelligence and moral and general improvement, and enjoys so many privileges, and is treated with so much humanity, as in Danville and its vicinity, owing largely to his efforts and influence. This is abolition *a la* the gospel, according to Jesus and his disciples. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Do unto others as ye would wish they should do unto you." "Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." It seems even to have been the gospel in the days of Abraham. "For I know him [Abraham], that he will command his children and his household [servants] after him, and they will keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." "And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house and all that were bought

with his money [his servants], every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin, in the self-same day, as God had said unto him." Abraham initiated his slaves into the Church of God by express divine command, and he trained them in the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment, and they and their descendants finally went down into Egypt with his grandson, and became part and parcel of the Israelitish nation. It was in this way that, in the course of a few centuries, the gospel largely extinguished slavery in the Roman Empire—one-half of whose population, about sixty millions, according to Gibbon, were slaves. In this way also the gospel, by its silent, steady, efficient influence on the hearts of master and slave, *abolished* slavery in the western nations of modern Europe. In *its presence* master and servant stand alike—they will be judged by one law, and have a common Master. Woe to the servant that "obeys" not "his master," and still greater woe to the master that withholdeth from his servant that which is "just and equal," especially the knowledge of the Bible of God—the words of eternal life to which he is equally and justly entitled. "Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them that have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. *Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts as in the day of slaughter.*" If this fearful denunciation lies against those who deprive the laborer of his just wages, how much more fearfully does it apply to those who refuse to their servants an equal participation in the knowledge of God's blessed Word; and, not only do not teach it to them themselves, but pass laws with heavy penalties against those who are willing to undertake the neglected duty, and rise even in *mobs* to prevent it. To the American people these millions of the children of Ham have been committed, not that they might live in "pleasure and wantonness" from their unpaid labor; not that "cotton might be king," but that He might reign to whom it has been promised and "decreed," that the *heathen* shall be given to Him for his inheritance and the *uttermost parts* of the earth for his possession. Now if we will execute the Lord's will—well; and if not, it *will* be executed whether we will or not. The decree "has gone forth"—it has been

recorded in the chancery of heaven,—let us beware how we “kick against the pricks:”—“Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God.” This digression does but express the sentiments and feelings which so long animated the life and efforts of Dr. Young.

The Presbyterian church in Danville had become vacant in 1834, and Dr. Young was invited by the congregation to supply their pulpit. He entered upon this double duty as an experiment, and continued its performance with unparalleled ability, acceptance and success till near his death, for over twenty years—in the first church until 1852, and then in the second church, a branch of the congregation, till 1857. The original congregation had grown under his ministry until its service had become too heavy a burden. A new church edifice had been erected in 1828, during the pastorate of Dr. David Nelson. It was so much larger than the wants of the congregation then required that some one, in astonishment, inquired of that eccentric and distinguished man for what purpose he was erecting so large a building. His reply was characteristic—for the millennium. Yet during the ministry of Dr. Young the house could not more than hold the ordinary assemblies on the Sabbath, and, on extraordinary occasions, it was crowded, galleries included, to its utmost capacity. During his connection with the first church, there united with it seven hundred and sixty-nine members, and a considerable number also united with the second church subsequently. Many of them were young men, students of college. A large number of the most useful and eminent ministers of the gospel now in Kentucky, and all the neighboring states, and some in more distant regions, are his pupils, as well as many eminent men in civil, political and social life. No man's influence in Kentucky and the western states has been more extensively useful. This long ministerial service was performed while he was, at the same time, executing, with eminent success, the varied and laborious duties of president of Centre College.

As a teacher, Dr. Young's ability was above that of even able men. Many men of fine acquirements fail to impart their knowledge with success; his attainments in the departments of moral and intellectual philosophy, were profound; and his knowledge was imparted with great clearness and facility.

There was a charm in his manner that failed not to interest the dullest youth. His intellect was subtle, and moral and intellectual questions were discussed by him *con amore*. Had his department been that of the ancient languages, his success and usefulness would perhaps have been still greater in imparting to our youth what is so much wanted in the west, a true taste for the Greek and Roman classics. Occasionally, as the exigencies of the institution required, he heard the recitations of the higher classes in the classics. A few weeks of instruction from him was often considered, by the young men, of higher value than months under ordinary good teaching. His attainments extended to every branch of interesting knowledge, and were large, accurate and elegant. As a disciplinarian he was kind and indulgent. He was obeyed rather from love than fear—his intercourse with his pupils was familiar and parental—he was always accessible, always ready to give advice and aid, and especially to indigent young men, who never failed to receive his fullest attention. No indigent and pious young man ever left the college for want of means to complete his course. Though indulgent, he was firm—though kind, he could make a perverse student feel to the quick, the lash of his good-humored but effective satire.

In 1839 the degree of D. D. was conferred upon him by the College of New Jersey, without his solicitation, or that of any of his friends, we think we may venture to say. The title was hardly ever applied to him at home, and while it was not rejected, was, in a measure, at least ignored. Some on whom it has been conferred, would hardly, we opine, consider it a compliment if they knew *how* it was conferred. By Centre College, under his direction, this and other literary titles were bestowed sparingly, and even then not always with his approbation. It would be well if the practice were wholly discontinued. Really able men are not elevated by them, while a factitious importance is thereby sometimes given very undeservedly.

As an extemporaneous preacher, always instructive, interesting, and eloquent, he had few equals any where. After a ministry of more than twenty years in the same congregations, his people greatly preferred to hear him to any occasional minister who filled the pulpit, however eminent. The church being in a central position of influence was frequently visited by



distinguished men from different parts of the United States. Persons who may have heard him preach occasionally from home, would not perhaps concede the eminence here ascribed to him, and which was universally so ascribed by his steady hearers. He no doubt often disappointed their expectations—he was in no sense a *star* preacher—there was nothing sensational about him, no glare of brilliancy, no special effort at the sublime or the beautiful or the profound. He had no memorized sermons. When he went from home, it was to obtain rest, and not to produce a sensation or to acquire reputation. As to preparation or effort, it was less perhaps than usual in his own pulpit; he was nearly, therefore, sure to disappoint them who, from his reputation, looked for what is usually esteemed eloquence, i. e., sensational brilliancy.

A peculiar interest was imparted to his discourses by apt illustrations, drawn from history and other sources. He possessed a special power in presenting and applying a narrative for illustration. He was eminently a practical preacher—aiming to make his hearers wiser and better. Doctrinal instruction he interwove into his sermons, but seldom made it the sole topic of one. While as a preacher he was not distinguished by peculiar profoundness, nor learning, nor elegance of phrase or delivery, and, in all these individual respects, was excelled by some men; yet no man of his age or country and hardly of any other, excelled him in all the united excellencies of an able, instructive and interesting preacher—one who could *wear*—who was listened to at the end of the year with as much interest as at the beginning, and so for a decade of years. He was learned without being pedantic—instructive without dullness—logical without subtlety—interesting without loss of dignity—ardent without enthusiasm—occasionally lofty without becoming tumid, and eloquent without meretricious ornament. His discourse was a continued and beautiful stream, always clear and equable, some times expanding into grandeur, occasionally swelling into sublimity, but never overflowing its banks nor losing its limpid and uniform beauty. He always preached extemporaneously from short notes.

His Wednesday evening lectures, commenting on successive paragraphs or chapters of several books of the Scriptures, were surpassingly luminous and instructive. Every difficulty van-

ished, every obscurity was removed. The meaning was placed in so simple and perspicuous a light that the dullest and most ignorant could not fail to understand. They were extemporaneous expositions, but if *reported* would have constituted a most valuable popular commentary on the sacred text. As a theologian he was both orthodox and liberal. He held firmly to all the doctrines of the Church to which he belonged, but presented them in a form and language at once scriptural, true, and acceptable even to the captious.

Dr. Young was eminently a wise and practical man. He attempted nothing impracticable, and desisted when he saw more evil than good was likely to be accomplished. All his efforts were directed by a cautious, wise, and temperate policy. Previously to the division of the Presbyterian Church in 1838, his ecclesiastical sympathies had been strongly with the New School party. He disapproved more particularly of the manner in which the four Synods were excised from the Church. After the division, however, living in the midst of an Old School Synod, he calmly and wisely acquiesced in, while he did not approve, the action of the General Assembly, and coöperated thenceforward with the Old School party cheerfully and heartily. There was nothing in his own views, ecclesiastical or theological, that prevented his doing so; and he was practically too wise a man to destroy his usefulness or disturb his peace of mind by cutting himself loose from the Church to join the excised or seceding party, merely because the General Assembly had committed, in his opinion, an unconstitutional, or, at least, extra-constitutional act. The more especially was he disposed to this course, when at the same time, he was strongly opposed to many of the measures and doctrines of the New School party. He did not regret that the Church was rid of the four excised Synods, but disapproved of the manner in which the act of excision was accomplished. By nature and policy he was opposed to all violent action. Some of those who voluntarily separated from the Church on account of the supposed unconstitutional act of the Assembly, and severely censured him for not joining them in their course, have lived to renew the ecclesiastical connections from which they withdrew, and for remaining in which they so strongly blamed him.

Dr. Young was personally a large donor to all the benevolent

operations of the Church, and to every other cause of charity. His example and his teachings raised the congregation to which he ministered, to be among the most liberal contributors to every benevolent agency in the state. His single congregation gave more to these causes than all the rest of the large and wealthy Presbytery of Transylvania, the first organized this side the mountains. While it was not in his power to do much ordinary pastoral work, to this part of it he paid special attention, and always saw that every member of the congregation who was absent when a subscription to any of the regular agencies of the Church was made, was personally called upon, and that the subscriptions were afterward collected and duly forwarded. The powerful influence of his example and attention to this important matter is sadly seen in the falling off of the congregational contributions, in both of the Danville churches, since his death.

The large amounts raised in the Danville congregations for the endowments of Centre College and the Danville Theological Seminary, were the direct consequence of his example and training. Without these they never would have been obtained.

In 1853 he was elected Moderator of the General Assembly and presided over that venerable body with distinguished success. His ready and perspicuous elocution was noticeable in the addresses he made to the representatives of corresponding and foreign Churches.

In private life he was eminently social; he delighted in social visitation among his flock, and was always welcome, and alike imparted and received enjoyment. In this connection it would be improper not to mention a social and literary club consisting of sixteen gentlemen, who meet alternately at the houses of the members semi-monthly, and spend three or four hours of the evening in festive and social entertainment and intellectual discussions. This club, which has quite a local celebrity, furnished him, for fifteen or sixteen years, a large amount of the highest and purest enjoyment. It was an element precisely suited to his social and intellectual character, amid

The feast of reason and the flow of soul.

Every subject, of every possible character, was here discussed by men of ability. Dr. Young never failed to speak nor to throw interest and light around every subject he handled. His

occasional absence was always felt, and his death was an irreparable breach in an association, which has been to its members a source alike of intellectual improvement and social pleasure. In his character, manners, and tastes, he was singularly simple. He eschewed all ceremony and parade—was free, accessible, easy, and yet refined and dignified. His health required recreation and exercise, and these he sought not unfrequently in the ball alley and even the marble yard with the boys, and seemed for the time to be utterly absorbed in the play, so much that a stranger would hardly have recognized, in the eager contestant in the game, the philosopher and divine. For the same object he took weekly bird hunts, and was a certain shot on the wing; and like Byron, who valued himself more for his success in swimming the Hellespont than for his poetry, he was at least apparently more proud of his skill as a sportsman than of his eloquence as a preacher. His pointers were privileged characters in his house, and stretched themselves before the fire with a full sense of their importance.

As remarked by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in his funeral discourse, his life was eminently favored of God—his first charge was in a church in which he had been preceded by more than one eminent man; he was removed to an Institution the foundation of which had been laid by others, the more easy superstructure of which he raised, in which he had willing and able coadjutors; he spent the greater part of life among a people intelligent and refined, who yet retained the simplicity and generosity of character of the early settlers of Kentucky, by whom he was universally beloved and respected; he was successful in all his labors; his domestic relations were singularly happy; his own temperament inclined him to enjoy all that was pleasant in life, and to cast off and pass by, with as little mental trouble as possible, all that was unpleasant: he was a practical optimist. No overwhelming calamity befell him in any of his relations, public or private; his pecuniary means were sufficient, and his health, though not stout, was good up to the last two years of his life. Few men have lived so usefully and happily, or died so regretted. His last illness, under which he languished nearly two years, was a disease of the stomach. The immediate cause of his death, which occurred June 23, 1857, was a hemorrhage of blood from the stomach. He died, as he lived, cheer-

fully and piously; some of his last words were addressed to his wife—"I shall see my father in heaven; shall I know him?" [He was a posthumous child.] "He was a better man than I, yet he had, on his death-bed, some doubts for a time." "But you have none?" was her inquiring reply. "No," said he, "I have not a cloud. My pathway has always been clear and bright, and the Lord has done more for me than I could have dared to ask of Him." A handsome monument, a shaft of marble, fifteen feet in height, with suitable inscriptions, has been erected to his memory in the beautiful cemetery of Danville by the citizens, professors, alumni, and students of Centre College. The following is the inscription on one of the panels from the graceful pen of the Rev. Dr. Humphrey:

To the Servant of God full of the Holy Ghost,  
To the Associate and Teacher,  
To the Pastor and Friend,  
Able, faithful and true,  
This Monument  
Is erected  
By his Colleagues and Pupils,  
And by his Brethren and Neighbors,  
Who trusted and loved him.

His publications were few, the chief have been referred to; he published a few sermons besides, and delivered an address at the inauguration of the Professors of the Danville Theological Seminary. A sermon on Prayer has been published since his death, by the American Tract Society. Composition was to him exceedingly painful. It may be admitted that oratory was his forte—that his intellectual powers were in the fullest exercise while on his legs, and that like Fox and Clay and many other able men, he was abler as a speaker than a writer.

Since his death a fund of fifty thousand dollars has been raised to build a new college edifice to be called by his name—an enterprise which he had set on foot previously to his death and bequeathed to his friends to accomplish. The Board of Trustees have procured and determined on an eligible plan, and its erection only awaits quiet in the country.

ART. VII.—*New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.*

To meet current error, and to aid the Church in its present conflict with it in a particular form, we propose to make a plain, popular exhibition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, such as any earnest student of the word of God might at least verify by an appeal to the Scriptures. Our purpose is not to discredit sacred learning, or the different and more common methods of teaching such truths, but by this to corroborate what is elsewhere and otherwise taught, and to encourage the study of the sacred Scriptures as a whole; and as far as we can to illustrate what strength there is in combining in one continued presentation, the many scattered utterances found in the word of God, on any one subject.

As the settlement of the authenticity, genuineness, inspiration and integrity of the sacred canon, stays the mind of the Christian immovably firm against artful attacks, cavils and quibbles of infidels on minor points; so we think a full and connected declaration of any fundamental doctrine of the sacred Scriptures, in scriptural words, is immeasurably comforting to the child of God, and destructive of error. For the sake of argument with those who prefer it, and in order to be brief, we shall confine ourselves for the present to the New Testament, and proceeding step by step will exhaust our collection of texts, in arranging under separate headings such quotations as we intend to use. And while on the one hand we do not depreciate the value of such exercises as go to explain the use of the neuter or masculine article in connection with the word *spirit* in Greek, or the absence of both, or such as decide the authority of 1 John, v: 7 and 8; and while we tell the biblical scholar that we intend to make our quotations from the common English version, the whole of which has been twice read and the notes of each reading carefully collated for this purpose—believing in the general substantial correctness of the version and the force of combined expression; on the other hand we say to the English reader that every passage has been diligently compared with the original, and also written out in Greek. And therefore, as we would not confuse him with a simple show of learning, so also we intend to employ all we have,



and will not knowingly make the version teach him what we do not believe the original means.

The name of the third person of the Trinity is used over two hundred and twenty times in the New Testament. He is called the Spirit, the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of grace, the Spirit of life, the Spirit of promise, the Spirit of adoption and the eternal Spirit. More than one hundred times he is called the Holy Spirit; the term Holy Ghost being used in the New Testament in all instances in our version, save four, though in the Greek the words are the same. The inferences from these terms are easily drawn, and we proceed to our first head:

1. THE HOLY SPIRIT IS GOD, the same in substance, equal in power and glory with the Father and the Son. When we say we prove such a doctrine as this, we mean merely that we cite the passages of Scripture in which it is asserted or assumed, or from which by fair inference it may be drawn. Much that is revealed in Scripture can not be said to be proved in any other sense, rests only upon the authority of God's naked word, and is received by faith alone.

On one occasion Christ healed one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb. The Pharisees charged that he did it by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. Part of Christ's reply is: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God then the kingdom of God is come unto you." And part of the same answer contains the fearful declaration, that whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.\* In another place a similar account is given, where the same charge is made, and the equivalent expression used by our Saviour is: "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you."† If this work done by the Spirit of God, may be truly said to be done by the finger of God, and to charge that it was done by the prince of devils is the highest form of blasphemy, and an unpardonable sin, surely the Spirit is God.

---

\* Matt. xii: 22-32.

† Luke, xi: 14-20.

Again: "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God."\*

Who is this Spirit that can so search the deep things of God, and in his infinite proportion be so familiar with the infinite mind of God, as your Spirit is acquainted with your own thinking and affairs, but God the Holy Ghost?

Paul says of the people of God, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."† And in another place, "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?"‡ Again, "In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit. So that to say your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, is equal to saying ye are the temple of God. The Church of God is builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets; they are God's dwelling; they are the habitation of God. He inhabits them; but they are the habitation of God through the Spirit. That is, they are the habitation of the Spirit, and the Spirit being God, they are the habitation of God.

Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained was it not thine own, and after it was sold was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God." So to lie unto the Holy Ghost was to lie unto God, for he is a divine person, and is so declared.§ So also the question he asks Sapphira, implies as much, "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Behold the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out."|| And the sudden destruction which came upon them both, illustrates the authority, dignity, and power of the being to whom they lied.

\* 1 Cor. ii: 9-11. † 1 Cor. iii: 16-17. ‡ 1 Cor. vi: 19. § Acts, v: 3, 4. || Acts, v: 9.

In the following three parallels, the Spirit occupies his place of equality with the Father and the Son.

"Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, *even* Jesus Christ: not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."\*

The three that bear "record" (or "witness," the Greek word is the same) in heaven, are here declared to be one. They are the Father; the Word, the same Word that was with God and was God, and was made flesh, the only begotten Son of God; and the Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit. Then the three witnesses in earth are the Spirit, the same as above, the water, which is the ordinance of baptism; and the blood, which is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But these are not said to be one, but to agree in one. If the Scriptures then are so careful as not to put the water and the blood on an equality with the Spirit, while witnessing to the same thing: so also they would have distinguished between the Spirit and the Father, and the Son, if it was not designed to teach precisely what is claimed and said; and these three are one. The real witness-bearer that gives efficacy to the testimony of the other two in earth, the water and the blood, is the Spirit. It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. He that rejecteth the witness of the Spirit, is he that believeth not God, and hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the "record;" that is, "witness," testimony that God gave of his Son.

So again in the commission, Christ sends forth his disciples

---

\*1 John, v: 5, 11.

with this charge, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."\* Consequently we are baptised in the name of the Holy Ghost as well as in the name of the Father, and the Son: and the meaning is the same. This is our God who saves us, and whom only we agree to obey and love—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The benediction of Paul to the Corinthians can not be without the same significance, when he says "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen."† All else that is written, taken as a whole, seems to go to establish this proposition, but we proceed to divide and arrange according to our plan.

2. THE HOLY SPIRIT IS THE AUTHOR OF THE SCRIPTURES.—All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.‡ And we learn that this inspiration of God, is the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. For Peter says "knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."§ Paul, also, quoting the Old Testament says, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers."|| So Peter said, "Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas."¶ The testimony of Christ is the same, when he applied the Old Testament Scriptures to himself and said, "For David himself said by the Holy Ghost."\*\* So again Peter says, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace *that should come* unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."†† So John, in Revelation, gives great weight to that

---

\* Matt. xxviii: 19. † 2 Cor. xiii: 13. ‡ 2 Tim. iii: 16. § 2 Peter, i: 20, 21. || Acts, xxviii: 25. ¶ Acts, i: 16. \*\* Mark, xii: 36. †† 1 Peter, i: 10, 11.

part of Scripture, by repeating seven times the call to attentive listening in these words, "He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."\*

So also the language quoted by Paul (Acts, xxviii: 25, 27), is attributed to the Holy Ghost, though in the original, Isaiah, vi: 8, 10, it is said to be spoken by Jehovah. And so in Heb. x: 15, 17, what Paul said the Holy Ghost said, Jeremiah, xxxi: 33, 34, says Jehovah said.

3. THE HOLY SPIRIT'S RELATIONS TO JESUS CHRIST UPON EARTH.—God is said to be the forner of his body.

Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.

Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. †

But Matthew and Luke both tell us that he was born of the Virgin Mary, and his body came not in the way of ordinary generation, but was formed by the power of the Holy Spirit.

And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. ‡

And this is so far from derogating from the proper divinity and eternal sonship of Christ, that even his human nature was to be called the Son of God, because formed by the power of the Holy Ghost, who is very God.

At the entrance of Christ upon his public ministry and induction into office as the great high priest, being inaugurated with baptism administered by John, the Holy Spirit manifested his presence and participation, as well as the Father and the Son. Matthew says:

Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him.

But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee and comest thou to me?

---

\* Rev. i: 10; ii: 7, 11, 17, 29; iii: 6, 13, 22; See also Heb. ix: 8. † Heb. x: 5, ‡ Luke i: 35; Matt. i: 18-20.

And Jesus answering said unto him, *Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* Then he suffered him.

And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him:

And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.\**

Mark says:

And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him.

And there came a voice from heaven, *saying*, Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. †

Luke says:

Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened,

And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, *Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.*

And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age. ‡

John says:

The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!

This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me.

And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.

And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.

And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

And I saw and bare record, that this is the Son of God. §

\* Matt. iii: 13-17.

† Luke, iii: 21-23.

‡ Mark, i: 9-11.

§ John, i: 29-34.



We learn from these accounts, not merely that the Spirit manifested his presence on this great occasion, but that *the Spirit, the Spirit of God, and the Holy Ghost*, are different, yet synonymous designations of one and the same divine person, dictated by himself.

Immediately after the baptism, came the temptation, and John says:

Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness,  
Being forty days tempted of the devil.\*

Mark says:

And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness.  
And he was there in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him,†

And Peter says, "God annointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power."‡

So again after the temptation, Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.§

Paul, speaking of Christ's great sacrifice, tells not only the nature and effect of it, but shows also that the Spirit bore some important relation to him in his crucifixion.

But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh:

How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? ||

Peter says, "whom they slew and hanged on a tree; him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly." ¶

\* John, iv: 1, 2.

† Mark, i: 12, 13; Luke, iv: 1; Matt. iv: 1.

‡ Acts, x: 38; Luke, iv: 18-21; John, iii: 34.

§ Luke, iv: 14.

|| Heb. ix: 11-14.

¶ Acts, x: 39, 40.

And in another place he says:

For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. \*

Paul says: "We have testified of God that he raised up Christ. † Again he says, "For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God." ‡

After the resurrection the Spirit still is with him, for Luke says:

The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach.

Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen. §

And finally, Paul says,

Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. ||

4. THE HOLY SPIRIT'S RELATIONS TO THE APOSTLES AND MEN WHO LOOKED FOR OR WERE ENGAGED IN THE OPENING OF THE NEW DISPENSATION; PREACHING THE GOSPEL; WRITING THE NEW TESTAMENT, ETC.—Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, "was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied." ¶

Of another it is said,

And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name *was* Simeon; and the same man *was* just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost *was* upon him.

And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ.

And he came by the Spirit into the temple.\*\*

\* 1 Pet. iii : 18; i : 3, 21.

† 1 Cor. xv : 15.

‡ 2 Cor. xiii : 4. Heb. xiii : 20. Eph. i : 19, 20. § Acts i : 1, 2.

¶ 1 Tim. iii : 16.

¶ Luke, i : 67.

\*\* Luke, ii : 25.

As it was predicted of Christ, so was it fulfilled. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."\*

Christ says to his disciples :

And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say :

For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.†

For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.‡

But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate : but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye : for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.§

Our Saviour continues his promises, and says further to his disciples :

These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you.

But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.||

But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.¶

Nevertheless, I tell you the truth : It is expedient for you that I go away : for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment :

Of sin, because they believe not on me ;

Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more ;

Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.

Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth : for he shall not speak of himself ; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak : and he will shew you things to come.

\* Matt. iii: 11. Mark i: 18. Luke, iii: 16. Acts, i: 5; Acts, xi: 16.

† Luke, xii: 11-12.

‡ Matt. x: 20.

§ Mark, xiii: 11.

¶ John, xiv: 25, 26.

¶ John, xv: 26.

He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.\*

Consequent upon these promises, was the injunction of our Lord, "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."†

He commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, and said "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."‡

And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.

And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.

And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.

And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.

Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language.

And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak, Galileans?

And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?§

Paul also was qualified in like manner for his office. Ananias said to him:

Brother Saul, the Lord (*even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest*) hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost.||

This expression is repeated; Peter was said to have been filled with the Holy Ghost. Stephen being full of the Holy Ghost. Barnabas full of the Holy Ghost. Saul filled with the Holy

\* John, xvi: 7-15.

† Luke, xxiv: 49.

‡ Acts, i: 3-8; ii: 16-18.

§ Acts, ii: 1-8; ii: 33.

|| Acts, xix: 17.

Ghost,\* did thus and so, as related. Agabus signified by the Spirit that there should be great drought throughout all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar.† A certain prophet, named Agabus, made a prediction concerning Paul which he began by saying, "Thus saith the Holy Ghost."‡

The Spirit speaketh expressly, says Paul, in reference to apostacy.§

We find the apostles confirming the words of Christ, by showing that his promises concerning the influences of the Spirit were all fulfilled. Paul says:

Now we have received, not the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.||

But the Holy Spirit not only dictated the words which they spake, and called to their remembrance the words of Christ; but he also gave power and efficacy to the words spoken by the apostles:

Paul says his preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit, and of Power."¶

For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost.\*\*

While Peter preached, the Holy Ghost fell on them that heard him, and hence they believed.††

And the word of God is declared to be the sword of the Spirit.‡‡

The Holy Spirit also controlled the movements of the apostles in their ministrations of the gospel. He directed to some places and forbade their going to others. In regard to the Gentiles, Paul says;

For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,

If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward:

---

\* Acts, iv: 8; vii: 55; xi: 24; Luke, i: 15; i: 41; Acts, iv: 31, xiii: 9. † Acts, xi: 28. ‡ Acts, xxi: 11. § 1 Tim. iv: 1. ¶ 1 Cor. ii: 12, 13. ¶ 1 Cor. ii: 4. \*\* 1 Thes. i: 5. †† Acts, x: 44; vi: 11, 15. ‡‡ Eph. vi: 17.

How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words;

Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ,

Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit;

That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.\*

In the case of Philip:

Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself to this chariot.†

And then again:

The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.

But Philip was found at Azotus: and passing through, he preached in all the cities, till he came to Cesarea.‡

In the case of Paul and Silas:

Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia;

After they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not.§

Paul and his company landed at Tyre, says the inspired writer,

And finding disciples, we tarried there seven days: who said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem.||

5. THE HOLY SPIRIT'S RELATIONS TO THE CHURCH.—There is the visible and the invisible church. There are outward signs and inward grace. There is an outward profession of Christ, and an inward faith in Christ. There is a baptism with water, and a baptism of the Spirit by which we are made members of the body of Christ, and which can not be effected by water baptism.

\* Eph. iii: 1, 6. Acts, x: 19. Acts, xi: 12. † Acts, viii: 29. ‡ Acts, viii: 39, 40. § Acts, xvi: 6, 7. Acts, xiii: 4. || Acts, xxi: 4.



For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body : so also is Christ.

For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.\*

The Spirit selected ministers for the Church.

Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers ; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.

As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.

And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid *their* hands on them, they sent *them* away.

So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia ; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.†

The Holy Spirit selected the ruling elders.

And from Miletus he [Paul] sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church.‡

And he charges them to

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.§

The Holy Spirit qualified the deacons too, for the twelve decided that they must be men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom ; and only such did the church select.||

So also the Holy Spirit bestows all qualifying gifts, for membership or office, and distributes them according to his own will.

For Paul says :

Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.

And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord.

---

\* 1 Cor. xii : 12, 13. Eph. iv : 3, 4. † Acts, xiii : 1, 4. ‡ Acts, xx : 17. § Acts, xx : 28. || Acts, vi : 1, 6.

And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.

For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;

To another, faith by the same Spirit; to another, the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;

To another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another *divers* kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues:

But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.\*

And again:

Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.†

Again: An Assembly at Jerusalem, composed of the Apostles and Elders with the whole church, or, as they represent the same, as the Apostles, and Elders, and brethren; decided a grave question, and sent down their decision to the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. They say "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," etc., showing the relation of the Holy Spirit to the matter.‡

6.—THE HOLY SPIRIT'S RELATIONS TO THE INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIAN. Paul tells the Thessalonians,

God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth.§

Peter says:

Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.||

\* 1 Cor. xii: 4-11.

† 1 Cor. xii: 27, 28.

‡ Acts, xv: 28.

§ 2 Thes. ii: 13.

|| 1 Peter, i: 2.

The Spirit reproves the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.\*

The Spirit and the bride say come.†

He is not only elected, reprov'd, and invited; but though dead he is brought to life, by the Spirit of life.‡

God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; (by grace ye are saved.)§

But

It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, *they* are spirit, and *they* are life.||

Changing the expression, we are said to become the children of God by being born of God. And John says:

Christ came unto his own, and his own received him not.

But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name:

Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.¶

But John says also, such are born of the Spirit.\*\*

Paul enumerates the sins of some, and then says to the Corinthians:

And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.††

Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

Which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour;

That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.‡‡

The Spirit not only justifies, sanctifies, and regenerates him; but he gives him liberty from the bondage of sin, and conforms him to the image of Christ; as Paul says:

\* John xvi: 8. † Rev. xxii: 17. ‡ Rom. viii: 2. § Eph. ii: 4.

¶ John vi: 68. ¶ John i: 11-13. \*\* John iii: 5, 6, 8; Gal. iv: 29. John,

ii: 29. †† 1 Cor. vi: 11. ‡‡ Titus, iii: 5-7.

Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even as by the Spirit of the Lord.\**

In his approaches to God the Father, the Christian is aided by the Spirit.

For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.†

And the direction is to pray in the Holy Ghost.‡

And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.§

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.¶

And the Spirit gives both aid and instruction that he may pray aright.

Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God.\*\*

And the Spirit is promised to him, and he is encouraged to ask for him, that he may be aided by him.††

And God hath given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him.‡‡

So also whatever good there is in him, is produced by the Spirit, and is therefore called the fruit of the Spirit.

But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,

Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.

\* 2 Cor. iii: 17, 18.

† Eph. ii: 18.

‡ Jude, 20; Eph. vi: 18.

§ Gal. iv: 6.

¶ Rom. viii: 14, 15.

\*\* Rom. viii: 26, 27.

†† Luke, xi: 13.

‡‡ Acts, v: 32.

And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts.\*

For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.†

For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.‡

Such are "manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart."§

He is led by the Spirit.|| He walks in the Spirit and after the Spirit.¶ He overcomes in the conflict with sin, and mortifies the deeds of the body through the Spirit.\*\*

His soul is purified, and he is enabled to obey the truth, and love the brethren, through the Spirit.††

He is strengthened with might by the Spirit, in the inner man.‡‡

He sows to the Spirit, and minds the things of the Spirit, and of the Spirit reaps life everlasting.§§

God gives him the earnest of the Spirit.|||| The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto him.¶¶

Through the Spirit, he waits for the hope of righteousness by faith.\*\*\*

Also the Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God.†††

He is sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,

Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.‡‡‡

And he has this assurance given him, that

If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.§§§

So John says,

\* Gal. v: 22-24. † Eph. v: 9. ‡ Eph. ii: 10. § 2 Cor. iii: 3. ¶ Rom. viii: 14. Gal. v: 18. ¶ Rom. viii: 1, 4. \*\* Gal. v: 17. Rom. viii: 13. †† 1 Peter, i: 22. †† Eph. iii: 16. Rom. xv: 13. §§ Gal. vi: 8. Rom. viii: 5. || 2 Cor. i: 22; v: 5. ¶¶ Rom. v: 5. \*\*\* Gal. v: 5. ††† Rom. viii: 16. ‡‡‡ Eph. i: 13, 14; iv: 30. §§§ Rom. viii: 11.

And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth : Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours ; and their works do follow them.\*

With such an array of Scripture testimony, it would seem impossible for any one who believes and reads the Scriptures, to doubt concerning the proper divinity, and personality, and office work of the Holy Spirit.

As Paul found some at Ephesus who had been baptized with John's baptism, who said "we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost, and whom Paul instructed, and who afterwards received His influences : so we trust there are others who though now ignorant, may yet come to the knowledge of him.†

But Stephen said to others,

Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost : as your fathers *did*, so do ye.‡

The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him : neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.§

And while living in the dispensation, or ministration of the Spirit more glorious than that of Moses,|| yet men need to be reminded not to quench, or grieve, or do despite to the Spirit of Grace, lest they perish.¶

And they who professing to be ministers of Christ, take occasion to ridicule this doctrine so clearly and fully taught in the Scriptures ; and they also who receive such teachings from them, may well tremble lest they blaspheme against the Holy Ghost and go beyond forgiveness. For Jesus, who bore all manner of contradiction of sinners against himself, declares in Matthew,

Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men : but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.

\* Rev. xiv : 13. † Acts xix : 1-6. ‡ Acts vii : 51. § 1 Cor. ii : 14. || 2 Cor. iii : 8. ¶ 1 Thes. v : 19 ; Eph. iv : 20 ; Heb. x : 29.

And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him : but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.\*

In Mark:

Verily, I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme :

But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation :

Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.†

In Luke :

And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him : but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven.‡

---

\* Matt. xii : 31, 32. † Mark iii : 28-30. ‡ Luke xii : 10, 12. (On the subject of the sin against the Holy Ghost, see Dr. R. J. Breckinridge's *Knowledge of God Objectively Considered*, Bk. III., chap. xvi., sec. 4, pp. 254-259.)



